arXiv:1611.10335v2 [math.ST] 4 Dec 2016

Mode-constrained estimation of a log-concave density

Charles R. Doss* **and Jon A. Wellner†**

School of Statistics
University of Minnesota
Minneapolis, MN 55455
e-mail: cdoss@stat.umn.edu
url: http://users.stat.umn.edu/~cdoss/

Department of Statistics, Box 354322
University of Washington
Seattle, WA 98195-4322
e-mail: jaw@stat.washington.edu
url: http://www.stat.washington.edu/jaw/

Abstract: We study nonparametric maximum likelihood estimation of a log-concave density function f with a known mode m. We develop asymptotic theory for the mode-constrained estimator, including, consistency, global rates of convergence, and local rates of convergence both in neighborhoods of the specified mode and away from the known mode. In local neighborhoods of the specified mode the constrained and unconstrained estimators differ, but away from the specified mode the constrained and unconstrained estimators are asymptotically equivalent. Software to compute the mode-constrained estimator is available in the R package `logcondens.mode`.

In a companion paper we use the mode-constrained MLE to develop a likelihood ratio test of the null hypothesis that the mode of f equals a specified valued m versus the alternative hypothesis that the mode of f differs from the specified valued m. We show that under the null hypothesis (and strict curvature of $\log f$ at the mode) the natural likelihood ratio statistic is asymptotically pivotal: that is, it converges in distribution to a limiting distribution which is free of nuisance parameters, thus playing the role of the χ^2_1 distribution in classical parametric statistical problems. The test can be inverted to form confidence intervals.

AMS 2000 subject classifications: Primary 62G07; secondary 62G05, 62G20.
Keywords and phrases: mode, consistency, convergence rate, empirical processes, convex optimization, log-concave, shape constraints.

*Supported in part by NSF Grants DMS-1104832 and a University of Minnesota Grant-In-Aid grant.
†Supported in part by NSF Grant DMS-1104832 and NI-AID grant 2R01 AI291968-04

Contents

1 Introduction and overview 3
2 Maximum likelihood estimator finite sample properties: unconstrained and mode-constrained 4
2.1 Notation and terminology 4
2.2 The unconstrained estimators 5
2.3 The mode-constrained estimators 7
3 Simulation results 8
4 Global Consistency 9
4.1 Hellinger consistency 9
4.2 Uniform consistency 14
4.3 Global rates of convergence 14
5 Local rates of convergence, limit processes, and limit theory 15
5.1 Local rates 15
5.2 The limit processes, unconstrained 18
5.3 The limit processes, mode-constrained 18
5.4 Pointwise limit theory, unconstrained 20
5.5 Pointwise limit theory, mode-constrained 20
6 Outlook and further problems 21
7 Proofs 22
7.1 Proofs of finite sample properties 22
7.2 Proofs for global consistency 27
7.3 Proofs for local rates of convergence, limit processes, and limit theory 35
7.3.1 Proofs for local rates of convergence 35
7.3.2 Proofs for mode-constrained limit process 46
7.3.3 Proofs for pointwise limit theory 63
8 Appendix: Supplemental material 77
Acknowledgements 78
References 79

1. Introduction and overview

The classes of log-concave densities on $\mathbb{R}$ and $\mathbb{R}^d$ have great importance in statistics for a variety of reasons including their many natural closure properties, including closure under convolution, closure under under affine transformations, closure under convergence in distribution, and others. These classes are also unimodal and serve as important nonparametric generalizations of the class of Gaussian distributions. Nonparametric estimation in these classes has developed rapidly in the past 10-15 years: existence of maximum likelihood estimators for log-concave densities apparently goes back to Walther [2002], while Pal, Woodroofe and Meyer [2007] established consistency. Dümbgen and Rufibach [2009] gave rates of convergence in uniform metrics defined on compact sets strictly contained in the support and provided efficient algorithms based on "active set" methods (see also Dümbgen and Rufibach [2011]). Balabdaoui, Rufibach and Wellner [2009] established pointwise limit distribution theory for the MLE's and obtained a limit distribution of the MLE of the mode under a natural curvature assumption. Progress has also been rapid in the case of log-concave and s-concave densities on $\mathbb{R}^d$ (see e.g. Cule, Samworth and Stewart [2010a], Cule and Samworth [2010a], and Dümbgen, Samworth and Schuhmacher [2011]), but our main focus here is on log-concave densities on $\mathbb{R}$.

On the other hand, only slow progress has been made so far on various questions of inference, including inference about the mode of a log-concave density. Of course it is well-known that log-concave densities are unimodal. In general "the mode" of a log-concave density f is not a single point, but rather the whole set of points $\{x \in \mathbb{R} : \ f(x) = \sup_{y \in \mathbb{R}} f(y)\}$. For a large sub-class of log-concave densities f this set does reduce to just one point. It is also well-known that the class of all unimodal densities is too large for maximum likelihood estimation; see e.g. Birgé [1997] and Doss and Wellner [2016a] where it is shown that MLE's do not exist for the smaller classes of s-concave densities for $s < -1$.

Mode-based estimation procedures, such as modal regression and mode-based clustering algorithms (e.g., Chen et al. [2016], Chacón [2016]), have received attention recently. Modal regression, where one estimates the conditional mode rather than the common conditional mean regression function, is useful and interesting because it can reveal very different types of structure than (mean) regression does. Similarly, mode-based clustering algorithms allow for very flexible structures. Despite the recent interest, we are still missing foundational tools related to modal inference.

Our main goals in this paper and the companion paper Doss and Wellner [2016b] are as follows:
(1) In this paper we consider mode-constrained estimation of a log-concave density via maximum likelihood methods: that is, we consider nonparametric maximum likelihood estimation of f in the class of log-concave densities with known mode, say m. Denoting the mode-constrained estimators by $\widehat{f}_n^0$, we develop properties of these constrained estimators analogous to (already available) properties of the unconstrained MLE's $\widehat{f}_n$.
(2) In the companion paper, Doss and Wellner [2016b] we use the results ob-

tained here to study the natural likelihood ratio test of $H: M(f) = m$ versus $K: M(f) \neq m$, where $M(f) = \inf\{x \in \mathbb{R} : f(x) = \sup_{y\in\mathbb{R}} f(y)\}$ is the (smallest) mode of f. Under a strict curvature condition we show that our test statistics $2\log\lambda_n = 2n\mathbb{P}_n(\log\widehat{f}_n - \log\widehat{f}_n^0)$ satisfy $2\log\lambda_n \to_d \mathbb{D}$ under H where $\mathbb{D}$ is pivotal; that is, the distribution of $\mathbb{D}$ is universal and does not depend on any parameter. Inversion of the family of tests then yields asymptotically correct confidence intervals for the mode m.

Thus our main goals here are the following:

(a) To show that the mode-constrained MLE's $\hat{f}_n^0$ exist and to provide useful characterizations thereof. This is done in Section 2.
(b) Establish useful finite-sample properties of $\hat{f}_n^0$ corresponding to similar properties of the unconstrained MLE's $\hat{f}_n$, and properties that relate the two estimators. This is also done in Section 2.
(c) Establish consistency of the mode-constrained MLE's with respect to uniform and Hellinger metrics. This is accomplished in Section 4.
(d) Establish global rates of convergence of the constrained estimators in the uniform and Hellinger metrics. This is also accomplished in Section 4.
(e) Establish local rates of convergence of the constrained estimators, and establish the (pointwise) asymptotic distribution of the constrained estimators. This is carried out in Section 5. We also provide a theorem giving the existence and uniqueness of a universal limit process that governs the asymptotic distribution of the constrained estimator.

Note that Doss and Wellner [2016a] and Kim and Samworth [2014] established the global rate of convergence of the unconstrained estimators in the Hellinger metric. We need additionally the rate of convergence in supremum norm on compact intervals.

In Section 3 we provide simulations illustrating properties of the estimators. Section 6 presents some open problems and conclusions. Section 7 provides proofs for the results for the constrained MLE as well as any previously unproven results for the unconstrained MLE. The Appendix provides some basic formulas and inequalities that we need.

2. Maximum likelihood estimator finite sample properties: unconstrained and mode-constrained

2.1. Notation and terminology

Several classes of concave functions will play a central role in this paper. In particular, we let

$$\mathcal{C} := \{\varphi : \mathbb{R} \to [-\infty, \infty) \mid \varphi \text{ is concave, closed, and proper}\} \tag{2.1}$$

and, for any fixed $m \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$\mathcal{C}_m := \{\varphi \in \mathcal{C} \mid \varphi(m) \geq \varphi(x) \text{ for all } x \in \mathbb{R}\}. \tag{2.2}$$

Here proper and closed concave functions are as defined in Rockafellar [1970], pages 24 and 50. We will follow the convention that all concave functions φ are defined on all of $\mathbb{R}$ and take the value $-\infty$ off of their effective domains where $\mathrm{dom}(\varphi) := \{x \ : \ \varphi(x) > -\infty\}$ (Rockafellar [1970], page 40). The classes of unconstrained and constrained log-concave densities are then

$$\mathcal{P} := \left\{ e^{\varphi} \ : \ \int e^{\varphi} d\lambda = 1, \ \ \varphi \in \mathcal{C} \right\}, \quad \text{and}$$
$$\mathcal{P}_m := \left\{ e^{\varphi} \ : \ \int e^{\varphi} d\lambda = 1, \ \ \varphi \in \mathcal{C}_m \right\}$$

where λ is Lebesgue measure on $\mathbb{R}$. We let $X_1, \ldots, X_n$ be the observations, independent and identically distributed with density f_0 with respect to Lebesgue measure. Here we assume throughout that $f_0 \in \mathcal{P}$ and frequently that $f_0 = e^{\varphi_0} \in \mathcal{P}_m$ for some $m \in \mathbb{R}$. We let $X_{(1)} < \cdots < X_{(n)}$ denote the order statistics of the X_i's, let $\mathbb{P}_n = n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \delta_{X_i}$ denote the empirical measure, and let $\mathbb{F}_n(x) = n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n 1_{(-\infty,x]}(X_i)$ denote the empirical distribution function. We let

$$\mathcal{K} := \log \circ \mathcal{P} = \left\{ \varphi \in \mathcal{C} \ : \ \int e^{\varphi} d\lambda = 1 \right\},$$
$$\mathcal{K}_m := \log \circ \mathcal{P}_m = \left\{ \varphi \in \mathcal{C}_m \ : \ \int e^{\varphi} d\lambda = 1 \right\}.$$

We define the log-likelihood criterion function $\Psi_n : \mathcal{C} \to \mathbb{R}$ by

$$\Psi_n(\varphi) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \varphi(X_i) - \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{\varphi(x)} dx = \mathbb{P}_n \varphi - \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{\varphi} d\lambda \tag{2.3}$$

where we have used the standard device of including the Lagrange term $\int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{\varphi(x)} dx$ in Ψ_n so that we do not need to restrict to concave functions in $\mathcal{K}$ or $\mathcal{K}_m$, but instead can maximize Ψ_n over all concave functions $\mathcal{C}$ or $\mathcal{C}_m$. This is as in Silverman [1982]; see Theorem 2.6 in subsection 2.3.

We will denote the unconstrained MLEs of φ_0, f_0, and F_0 by $\widehat{\varphi}_n$, $\widehat{f}_n$, and $\widehat{F}_n$ respectively. The corresponding constrained estimators with mode m will be denoted by $\widehat{\varphi}_n^0$, $\widehat{f}_n^0$, and $\widehat{F}_n^0$. Thus

$$\widehat{\varphi}_n \equiv \operatorname*{argmax}_{\varphi \in \mathcal{C}} \Psi_n(\varphi), \quad \text{and} \quad \widehat{\varphi}_n^0 \equiv \operatorname*{argmax}_{\varphi \in \mathcal{C}_m} \Psi_n(\varphi).$$

Our main goal in this paper is to develop theory concerning the mode-constrained estimators $\widehat{\varphi}_n^0$, $\widehat{f}_n^0$, and $\widehat{F}_n^0$. In the companion paper Doss and Wellner [2016b] we use the results developed here to study the log-likelihood ratio statistics $2 \log \lambda_n = 2n\mathbb{P}_n \log(\widehat{f}_n / \widehat{f}_n^0) = 2n\mathbb{P}_n(\widehat{\varphi}_n - \widehat{\varphi}_n^0)$.

2.2. The unconstrained estimators

We begin by briefly recalling the known facts concerning the unconstrained MLEs on $\mathbb{R}$.

Theorem 2.1. *(Pal, Woodroofe and Meyer [2007], Rufibach [2006]) For $n \geq 2$ the nonparametric MLE $\widehat{\varphi}_n$ exists and is unique. It is linear on all intervals $[X_{(j)}, X_{(j+1)}]$, $j = 1, \ldots, n$. Moreover, $\widehat{\varphi}_n = -\infty$ and $\widehat{f}_n = 0$ on $\mathbb{R} \setminus [X_{(1)}X_{(n)}]$.*

The first characterization theorem for the unconstrained MLE is as follows:

Theorem 2.2. *(Rufibach [2006], Dümbgen and Rufibach [2009]) Let $\widehat{\varphi}_n$ be a concave function such that $\{x : \ \widehat{\varphi}_n(x) > -\infty\} = [X_{(1)}, X_{(n)}]$. Then $\widehat{\varphi}_n$ is the MLE if and only if*

$$\int \Delta(x) d\mathbb{F}_n(x) \leq \int \Delta \exp(\widehat{\varphi}_n(x)) dx = \int \Delta(x) d\widehat{F}_n(x)$$

for any function $\Delta : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ such that $\widehat{\varphi}_n + \lambda\Delta$ is concave for some $\lambda > 0$.

To state the second characterization theorem for the unconstrained MLE, we first introduce some further notation: For a continuous and piecewise linear function $h : [X_{(1)}, X_{(n)}] \to \mathbb{R}$ we define its *knots* to be

$$\mathcal{S}_n(h) := \{t \in (X_{(1)}, X_{(n)}) : \ h'(t-) \neq h'(t+)\} \cup \{X_{(1)}, X_{(n)}\}.$$

Note that $\widehat{\varphi}_n$ is such a function and we have

$$\mathcal{S}_n(\widehat{\varphi}_n) \subset \{X_{(1)}, X_{(2)}, \ldots, X_{(n)}\}.$$

Theorem 2.3. *(Rufibach [2006]), Dümbgen and Rufibach [2009]) Let $\widetilde{\varphi}$ be a concave function which is linear on all intervals $[X_{(j)}, X_{(j+1)}]$ and with $\widetilde{\varphi} = -\infty$ on $\mathbb{R} \setminus [X_{(1)}, X_{(n)}]$. Let $\widetilde{F}_n(x) \equiv \int_{-\infty}^x \exp(\widetilde{\varphi}(y))dy$, and assume further that $\widetilde{\varphi} \in \mathcal{K}$. Then $\widetilde{\varphi} = \widehat{\varphi}_n$ and $\widetilde{F}_n = \widehat{F}_n$ if and only if*

$$\widetilde{H}_n(t) \equiv \int_{X_{(1)}}^t \widetilde{F}_n(y)dy \leq \int_{X_{(1)}}^t \mathbb{F}_n(y)dy \equiv \mathbb{Y}_n(t) \quad \text{for all} \ \ t \in \mathbb{R}$$

with equality if $t \in \mathcal{S}_n(\widehat{\varphi}_n)$.

These characterization theorems have two important corollaries:

Corollary 2.4. *$\mathbb{F}_n - n^{-1} \leq \widehat{F}_n \leq \mathbb{F}_n$ on $\mathcal{S}_n(\widehat{\varphi}_n)$.*

Now for any distribution function F on $\mathbb{R}$ let $\mu(F) \equiv \int x dF(x)$ and $\mathrm{Var}(F) = \int (x - \mu(F))^2 dF(x)$.

Corollary 2.5. *$\mu(\widehat{F}_n) = \mu(\mathbb{F}_n)$ and $Var(\widehat{F}_n) \leq Var(\mathbb{F}_n)$.*

2.3. The mode-constrained estimators

To develop theory for the mode-constrained estimators $\widehat{\varphi}_n^0$, $\widehat{f}_n^0$, and $\widehat{F}_n^0$ it will be helpful to consider *mode-augmented data* $Z_1, \ldots, Z_N$ with $N = n$ or $n+1$ as follows:

(1) If $m = X_{(k)}$ for some $k \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$ then $Z_j \equiv X_{(j)}$ for $j \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$ and $N = n$.

(2) If $m \in (X_{(k-1)}, X_{(k)})$ for some $k \in \{1, \ldots, n+1\}$ (where $X_{(0)} \equiv -\infty$ and $X_{(n+1)} \equiv +\infty$), then we define $Z_i \equiv X_{(i)}$ for $i \in \{1, \ldots, k-1\}$, $Z_k \equiv m$, and $Z_i \equiv X_{(i-1)}$ for $i \in \{k+1, \ldots, n+1\}$. In this case $\underline{Z} = (X_{(1)}, \ldots, X_{(k-1)}, m, X_{(k)}, \ldots, X_{(n)}) \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ and $N = n+1$.

With this notation we have the following analogue of Theorem 2.1.

Theorem 2.6. *(Doss [2013b]) For $N \geq 2$ the mode-constrained MLE $\widehat{\varphi}_n^0$ exists and is unique. It is piecewise linear with knots at the Z_i's and domain $[Z_1, Z_N]$. if m is not a data point, then at least one of $(\widehat{\varphi}_n^0)'(m+)$ or $(\widehat{\varphi}_n^0)'(m-)$ is 0.*

Remark 2.7. With probability one no data point will equal the true mode $M(f_0)$. However, in our companion paper Doss and Wellner [2016b] we will be interested in inverting a hypothesis test to form a confidence region, and hence will want to allow m to vary over $\mathbb{R}$.

The following theorem characterizing the mode constrained MLE $\widehat{\varphi}_n^0$ is the natural analogue of Theorem 2.2:

Theorem 2.8. *(Doss [2013b]) Suppose that $\widehat{\varphi}_n^0 \in \mathcal{K}_m$. Then $\widehat{\varphi}_n^0$ is the MLE over $\mathcal{K}_m$ if and only if*

$$\int \Delta d\mathbb{F}_n \leq \int \Delta d\widehat{F}_n^0 \tag{2.4}$$

for all Δ such that $\widehat{\varphi}_n^0 + t\Delta \in \mathcal{C}_m$ for some $t > 0$.

Now suppose that $\widehat{\varphi}_n^0$ is piecewise linear with knots at the (mode-augmented) data, let $m \in \mathbb{R}$, and assume that $\widehat{\varphi}_n^0 \in \mathcal{K}_m$. Let $\widehat{f}_n^0 \equiv \exp(\widehat{\varphi}_n^0)$ and for $t \in \mathbb{R}$ define

$$\begin{array}{ll} \mathbb{F}_{n,L}(t) \equiv \int_{(-\infty,t]} d\mathbb{F}_n(y), & \mathbb{F}_{n,R}(t) \equiv \int_{[t,\infty)} d\mathbb{F}_n(y), \\ \mathbb{Y}_{n,L}(t) \equiv \int_{X_{(1)}}^t \mathbb{F}_{n,L}(x)dx, & \mathbb{Y}_{n,R}(t) \equiv \int_t^{X_{(n)}} \mathbb{F}_{n,R}(x)dx, \\ \widehat{F}_{n,L}^0(t) \equiv \int_{-\infty}^t \widehat{f}_n^0(y)dy, & \widehat{F}_{n,R}^0(t) \equiv \int_t^{X_{(n)}} \widehat{f}_n^0(y)dy, \\ \widehat{H}_{n,L}^0(t) \equiv \int_{X_{(1)}}^t \widehat{F}_{n,L}^0(x)dx, & \widehat{H}_{n,R}^0(t) \equiv \int_t^{X_{(n)}} \widehat{F}_{n,R}^0(x)dx. \end{array} \tag{2.5}$$

Definition 2.9. With m considered as a possible knot of $\widehat{\varphi}_n^0$ we say that m is a *left knot* (or LK) if $(\widehat{\varphi}_n^0)'(m-) > 0$ and that m is a *right knot* (or RK) if $(\widehat{\varphi}_n^0)'(m+) < 0$. We say that m is *not a knot* (or NK) if $(\widehat{\varphi}_n^0)'(m) = 0$. All other knots are considered to be left knots (LKs) or right knots (RKs) depending on whether they are strictly smaller or strictly larger than m.

Traditionally, $\mathbb{F}_{n,L}$ and $\mathbb{F}_{n,R}$ are known as the empirical distribution function (d.f.) and survival function, but we prefer the L and R notation which is in parallel with the integrated processes. Note that if m is not a data point, then it cannot be both a LK and a RK. If m is a data point, then it is a LK and a RK if and only if $\widehat{\varphi}_n^0$ coincides with the unconstrained MLE $\widehat{\varphi}_n$.

Theorem 2.10. *(Doss [2013b]) With the above notation, $\widehat{\varphi}_n^0$ is the MLE of $\varphi \in \mathcal{K}_m$ if and only if*

$$\widehat{H}_{n,L}^0(t) \le \mathbb{Y}_{n,L}(t) \quad \text{for} \quad X_{(1)} \le t \le m \tag{2.6}$$

and

$$\widehat{H}_{n,R}^0(t) \le \mathbb{Y}_{n,R}(t) \quad \text{for} \quad m \le t \le X_{(n)} \tag{2.7}$$

with equality in (2.6) if t is a left knot of $\widehat{\varphi}_n^0$ and equality in (2.7) if t is a right knot of $\widehat{\varphi}_n^0$.

Remark 2.11. The conditions (2.6) and (2.7) only involve data from the left and right sides of m, and hence are separate characterizations in a sense. But they are coupled by way of the (global) constraint $\widehat{F}_n^0(X_{(n)}) = 1$ (or, equivalently, $\widehat{\varphi}_n^0 \in \mathcal{K}_m$) which involves the data on *both* sides of m.

The following corollary of the characterization Theorems 2.8 and 2.10 is analogous to Corollary 2.4:

Corollary 2.12 (Corollary 2.0.9 of Doss [2013b])**.** *$\mathbb{F}_n - n^{-1} \le \widehat{F}_n^0 \le \mathbb{F}_n$ on $\mathcal{S}_n(\widehat{\varphi}_n^0) \setminus \{m\}$.*

Proposition 2.13. *Suppose that either*

$$l \equiv \tau_{n,i_1} \le \tau_{n,i_2}^0 < \tau_{n,i_3} \le \tau_{n,i_4}^0 \equiv r \quad \text{or} \quad l \equiv \tau_{n,i_1}^0 \le \tau_{n,i_2} < \tau_{n,i_3}^0 \le \tau_{n,i_4} \equiv r$$

where $\tau_{n,i_j} \in S_n(\widehat{\varphi}_n)$, $\tau_{n,i_j}^0 \in S_n(\widehat{\varphi}_n^0)$, for $j = 1, \ldots, 4$, and where all the knots are strictly below m. Then there exists $x \in (l, r)$ such that $\widehat{F}_n^0(x) = \widehat{F}_n(x)$. Similarly the conclusion holds if all knots are strictly greater than m. If m is a left knot, then we allow $\tau_{n,i_4}^0 = m$, and if m is a right knot, then we allow $\tau_{n,i_1}^0 = m$.

Proposition 2.14. *If $\widehat{F}_n^0 - \widehat{F}_n = 0$ at both x_1 and x_2 with $x_1 < x_2$, then there is a point $x \in (x_1, x_2)$ such that $\widehat{f}_n^0(x) = \widehat{f}_n(x)$.*

3. Simulation results

Software to compute the mode-constrained estimator, and also to implement the likelihood ratio test and corresponding confidence intervals studied in Doss and Wellner [2016b], is available in the package `logcondens.mode` [Doss, 2013a]

in R [R Core Team, 2016]. Here we illustrate the existence and characterization results on simulated data. Figures 1–4 each give 8 plots corresponding to a single parent distribution with log-concave density, which are standard normal (used twice), Gumbel with density $e^{-(x+e^{-x})}$ for $x \in \mathbb{R}$, and Gamma with density xe^{-x} for $x \geq 0$. The first column of each panel corresponds to a Monte Carlo sample of size $n = 20$ from the parent distribution, and the second column corresponds to $n = 200$. The data points are represented by vertical hash lines along the bottom of each plot. The density, log density, and distribution function are plotted in the top three rows, with the unconstrained log-concave MLE in red, the mode-constrained MLE in blue, and the true (unknown) function in black. The empirical df $\mathbb{F}_n$ is plotted in green in the third row. In the last row, we plot $\mathbb{Y}_{n,L} - \widehat{H}^0_{n,L}$ and $\mathbb{Y}_{n,R} - \widehat{H}^0_{n,R}$ in blue to illustrate Theorem 2.10 and $\mathbb{Y}_n - \widetilde{H}_n$ in red, with $\widetilde{\varphi}_n = \widehat{\varphi}_n$, to illustrate Theorem 2.3. To distinguish $\mathbb{Y}_{n,L} - \widehat{H}^0_{n,L}$ and $\mathbb{Y}_{n,R} - \widehat{H}^0_{n,R}$ which are both blue, recall $(\mathbb{Y}_{n,L} - \widehat{H}^0_{n,L})(X_{(1)}) = 0$ and $(\mathbb{Y}_{n,R} - \widehat{H}^0_{n,R})(X_{(n)}) = 0$. In all the plots, dashed vertical red lines give $S_n(\widehat{\varphi}_n)$ and dashed vertical blue lines give $S_n(\widehat{\varphi}^0_n)$ (which frequently overlap). The solid blue line is the specified mode value for the mode-constrained MLE. The solid black line (when it differs from the solid blue) is the true value of m. In the first three figures m is well-specified and in the final figure m is misspecified.

4. Global Consistency

4.1. Hellinger consistency

Pal, Woodroofe and Meyer [2007] showed that the unconstrained MLE's $\{\widehat{f}_n\}$ are a.s. consistent in the Hellinger metric H where $H^2(p,q) \equiv (1/2)\int\{\sqrt{p}-\sqrt{q}\}^2 d\lambda$, and their methods also yield consistency for the MLEs over any sub-class $\mathcal{S} \subset \mathcal{P}$ for which the MLEs $\{\widehat{g}_n\}$ exist and satisfy

$$\sup_n \sup_x \log \widehat{g}_n(x) < \infty \quad \text{a.s..}$$

This nicely includes the subclass $\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{P}_m$ when $f_0 \in \mathcal{P}_m$; i.e. the mode m has been correctly specified. Thus we have the following two consistency theorems:

Theorem 4.1. *(Pal, Woodroofe and Meyer [2007]). If $f_0 \in \mathcal{P}$, then $H^2(\widehat{f}_n, f_0) \to_{a.s.} 0$.*

Theorem 4.2. *(Doss [2013b]) If $f_0 \in \mathcal{P}_m$, then $H^2(\widehat{f}^0_n, f_0) \to_{a.s.} 0$.*

When $f_0 \in \mathcal{P} \setminus \mathcal{P}_m$, then we can show that $H^2(\widehat{f}^0_n, f^*_0) \to_{a.s.} 0$ where f^*_0 satisfies

$$K(f_0, f^*_0) = \inf_{g \in \mathcal{P}_m} K(f_0, g),$$

and $K(f,g) = \int f \log(f/g) d\lambda$. But we will not pursue this here since our present goal in this paper is understanding the null hypothesis (or correctly specified)



FIG 1.
$N(0,1)$, $n = 20$ *and* $n = 200$, $m = 0$ *well-specified.*



FIG 2.
Gumbel with density $e^{-(x+e^{-x})}$ *for* $x \in \mathbb{R}$, $n = 20$ *and* $n = 200$, $m = 0$ *well-specified.*



FIG 3.
Gamma with density xe^{-x} for $x \geq 0$, $n = 20$ and $n = 200$, $m = 1$ well-specified.



FIG 4.
$N(0,1)$, $n = 20$ *and* $n = 200$, $m = 0$ *true but* $m = 1$ *specified.*

behavior of the constrained estimators $\widehat{\varphi}_n^0$, $\widehat{f}_n^0$, and $\widehat{F}_n^0$. See Doss and Wellner [2016b] for some initial steps concerning the power of the likelihood ratio test based on $2\log\lambda_n$ when $f_0 \in \mathcal{P} \setminus \mathcal{P}_m$.

4.2. Uniform consistency

Hellinger consistency of $\widehat{f}_n$ and $\widehat{f}_n^0$ leads easily to uniform convergence of $\widehat{\varphi}_n$ and $\widehat{f}_n$ and $\widehat{\varphi}_n^0$ and $\widehat{f}_n^0$ on compact sets strictly contained in the support of f_0 via standard methods; see e.g. Lemma 3.14 of Seregin and Wellner [2010]. Thus we have the following two results:

Corollary 4.3. *Let $K = [b, c]$ be a closed interval contained in the interior of the support of $f_0 \in \mathcal{P}$. Then*

$$\sup_{t\in K} |\widehat{\varphi}_n(t) - \varphi_0(t)| \to_{a.s.} 0 \quad as \quad n \to \infty$$

and

$$\sup_{t\in K} |\widehat{f}_n(t) - f_0(t)| \to_{a.s.} 0 \quad as \quad n \to \infty.$$

Corollary 4.4. *Let $K = [b, c]$ be a closed interval contained in the interior of the support of $f_0 \in \mathcal{P}_m$. Then*

$$\sup_{t\in K} |\widehat{\varphi}_n^0(t) - \varphi_0(t)| \to_{a.s.} 0 \quad as \quad n \to \infty$$

and

$$\sup_{t\in K} |\widehat{f}_n^0(t) - f_0(t)| \to_{a.s.} 0 \quad as \quad n \to \infty.$$

Remark 4.5. Under the concavity shape constraint, uniform consistency of the estimators implies uniform consistency of the derivatives on intervals of continuity. Thus if φ_0' is continuous on K it follows that $\|\widehat{\varphi}_n' - \varphi_0'\|_\infty^K \to_{a.s.} 0$ if $f_0 \in \mathcal{P}$ and $\|(\widehat{\varphi}_n^0)' - \varphi_0'\|_\infty^K \to_{a.s.} 0$ if $f_0 \in \mathcal{P}_m$; see Corollary 3.1.11 of Doss [2013b].

4.3. Global rates of convergence

The global consistency results of the last two subsections for the unconstrained MLEs with respect to Hellinger and uniform metrics have been strengthened to rate results in Doss and Wellner [2016a] and Dümbgen and Rufibach [2009]. Here we state the analogous results for the mode-constrained MLEs. To state the uniform results we define $\mathcal{H}^{\beta,L}(I)$ to be the collection of real-valued functions g on the closed interval I satisfying $|g(y) - g(x)| \le L|y - x|$ if $\beta = 1$ and $|g'(y) - g'(x)| \le L|y - x|^{\beta-1}$ if $\beta > 1$, for all $x, y \in I$. We let $\rho_n \equiv n^{-1}\log n$.

Theorem 4.6. *Suppose that $f_0 \in \mathcal{P}$.*
A. (Doss and Wellner [2016a]) Then $n^{2/5} H(\widehat{f}_n, f_0) = O_p(1)$.
B. (Dümbgen and Rufibach [2009]) If $\varphi_0 \in \mathcal{H}^{\beta,L}(K)$ for some $1 \le \beta \le 2$, $L > 0$, and $K = [b,c] \subset int(\{f_0 > 0\})$, then

$$\sup_{t \in K} (\widehat{\varphi}_n - \varphi_0)(t) = O_p(\rho_n^{\beta/(2\beta+1)}), \quad \text{and}$$
$$\sup_{t \in K_n} (\varphi_0 - \widehat{\varphi}_n)(t) = O_p(\rho_n^{\beta/(2\beta+1)})$$

where $K_n \equiv [b + \rho_n^{1/(2\beta+1)}, c - \rho_n^{1/(2\beta+1)}]$. These results remain true when $\widehat{\varphi}_n$ is replaced by $\widehat{f}_n$ and φ_0 by f_0.

As we will show here, analogous results hold for the mode-constrained estimators $\widehat{\varphi}_n^0$ and $\widehat{f}_n^0$, under a curvature assumption at m.

Assumption 1. We assume that X_i, $i = 1, \ldots, n$ are i.i.d. $f_0 = e^{\varphi_0}$ where φ_0 is concave with mode m, and that f_0 and thus φ_0 are twice continuously-differentiable at m, and $\varphi_0''(m) < 0$.

In particular, this entails that m is interior to the support of f_0.

Theorem 4.7. *Suppose that $f_0 \in \mathcal{P}_m$.*
A. (Doss [2013b]). Then $n^{2/5} H(\widehat{f}_n^0, f_0) = O_p(1)$.
B. If $\varphi_0 \in \mathcal{H}^{2,L}(K)$ for some $L > 0$, Assumption 1 holds, and $K = [b,c] \subset int(\{f_0 > 0\})$, then

$$\sup_{t \in K} (\widehat{\varphi}_n^0 - \varphi_0)(t) = O_p(\rho_n^{2/5}), \quad \text{and}$$
$$\sup_{t \in K_n} (\varphi_0 - \widehat{\varphi}_n^0)(t) = O_p(\rho_n^{2/5}),$$

where $K_n \equiv [b + \rho_n^{1/5}, c - \rho_n^{1/5}]$. These results remain true when $\widehat{\varphi}_n^0$ is replaced by $\widehat{f}_n^0$ and φ_0 by f_0.

In recent work Kim, Guntuboyina and Samworth [2016] have strengthened Theorem 4.6 A. to show when the true density is piecewise affine that faster rates of convergence than $n^{2/5}$ are attained by $\widehat{f}_n$. We do not need these results for our development though, and analogous results are as of yet not known for $\widehat{f}_n^0$.

5. Local rates of convergence, limit processes, and limit theory

5.1. Local rates

Our focus here is on the local behavior of $\widehat{\varphi}_n^0$ in a neighborhood of the mode m. Throughout this section we either make the basic curvature assumption given in Assumption 1 at m, or an analogous assumption at $x_0 \neq m$.

Assumption 2. We assume that X_i, $i = 1, \ldots, n$ are i.i.d. $f_0 = e^{\varphi_0}$ where φ_0 is concave with mode m, and that f_0 and thus φ_0 are twice continuously-differentiable at $x_0 \neq m$, with $\varphi_0''(x_0) < 0$ and $f_0(x_0) > 0$.

The following key property of the knots $\{\tau_{n,i}\}$ of the unconstrained estimators $\{\widehat{\varphi}_n\}$ is an extension of Theorem 4.3 of Balabdaoui, Rufibach and Wellner [2009]. The statement and proof for the knots $\{\tau^0_{n,i}\}$ of the constrained estimators $\{\widehat{\varphi}^0_n\}$ is due to Doss [2013b].

Proposition 5.1. *Suppose that Assumption 1 holds.*
A. Let $\tau_+(\xi_n)$ denote the smallest knot of $\widehat{\varphi}_n$ strictly greater than ξ_n, and let $\tau_-(\xi_n)$ denote the largest knot of $\widehat{\varphi}_n$ strictly smaller than ξ_n. Then for all $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists $C > 0$ such that for any random variables $\xi_n \to_p m$

$$P(n^{1/5}(\tau_+(\xi_n) - \tau_-(\xi_n)) \geq C) \leq \varepsilon$$

for $n \geq N$ for some N.
B. Let $\tau^0_+(\xi_n)$ denote the smallest knot of $\widehat{\varphi}^0_n$ strictly greater than ξ_n, and let $\tau^0_-(\xi_n)$ denote the largest knot of $\widehat{\varphi}^0_n$ strictly smaller than ξ_n. Then for all $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists $C^0 > 0$ such that for any random variables $\xi_n \to_p m$

$$P(n^{1/5}(\tau^0_+(\xi_n) - \tau^0_-(\xi_n)) \geq C^0) \leq \varepsilon$$

for $n \geq N$ for some N^0.
C. In A and B the integers N, N^0 may depend on ξ_m but C, C^0 do not depend on ξ_m.

A version of Proposition 5.1 allows us to transfer tightness of the local processes of the unconstrained estimators to tightness of the local processes for the constrained estimators at any point x_0 where $\varphi_0''(x_0) < 0$. Here is the exact statement.

Proposition 5.2. *Suppose that Assumption 1 holds at $x_0 = m$ or Assumption 2 holds at $x_0 \neq m$, and let $0 < C < \infty$ be fixed. With $(\widehat{\varphi}^0_n)'$ and $\widehat{\varphi}'_n$ denoting either the right or left derivative,*

$$\sup_{s,t \in [x_0 - Cn^{-1/5}, x_0 + Cn^{-1/5}]} |(\widehat{\varphi}^0_n)'(t) - \widehat{\varphi}'_n(s)| = O_p(n^{-1/5}), \tag{5.1}$$

and hence, in particular,

$$\sup_{t \in [x_0 - Cn^{-1/5}, x_0 + Cn^{-1/5}]} |(\widehat{\varphi}^0_n)'(t) - \widehat{\varphi}'_n(t)| = O_p(n^{-1/5}). \tag{5.2}$$

Furthermore,

$$\sup_{s,t \in [x_0 - Cn^{-1/5}, x_0 + Cn^{-1/5}]} |(\widehat{\varphi}^0_n)(t) - \widehat{\varphi}_n(s) - \widehat{\varphi}'_n(s)(t - s)| = O_p(n^{-2/5}), \tag{5.3}$$

and hence, in particular,

$$\sup_{t \in [x_0 - Cn^{-1/5}, x_0 + Cn^{-1/5}]} |\widehat{\varphi}^0_n(t) - \widehat{\varphi}_n(t)| = O_p(n^{-2/5}). \tag{5.4}$$

We may replace the intervals $[x_0 - Cn^{-1/5}, x_0 + Cn^{-1/5}]$ *by* $[\xi_n - Cn^{-1/5}, \xi_n + Cn^{-1/5}]$ *for any* $\xi_n \to m$. *Then the random variables implied by the* O_p *upper bounds depend on* C *but not on* ξ_n.

Proposition 5.2 has several further corollaries. In particular (5.2) holds with $(\widehat{\varphi}_n^0)'$, $\widehat{\varphi}_n'$ replaced by $(\widehat{f}_n^0)'$, $\widehat{f}_n'$, and (5.4) holds with $\widehat{\varphi}_n^0$, $\widehat{\varphi}_n$ replaced by $\widehat{f}_n^0$, $\widehat{f}_n$:

Proposition 5.3. *Suppose the hypotheses of Proposition 5.2 hold. Then*

$$\sup_{t\in[x_0-Cn^{-1/5},x_0+Cn^{-1/5}]} |(\widehat{f}_n^0)'(t) - \widehat{f}_n'(t)| = O_p(n^{-1/5}). \tag{5.5}$$

and

$$\sup_{t\in[x_0-Cn^{-1/5},x_0+Cn^{-1/5}]} |\widehat{f}_n^0(t) - \widehat{f}_n(t)| = O_p(n^{-2/5}). \tag{5.6}$$

We may replace the intervals $[x_0 - Cn^{-1/5}, x_0 + Cn^{-1/5}]$ *by* $[\xi_n - Cn^{-1/5}, \xi_n + Cn^{-1/5}]$ *for any* $\xi_n \to m$. *Then the random variables implied by the* O_p *upper bounds depend on* C *but not on* ξ_n.

The following corollary concerning tightness of the local processes based on the constrained estimators $\widehat{\varphi}_n^0$ is an analogue of from the corresponding results for the unconstrained estimators given by Lemma 4.5 of Balabdaoui, Rufibach and Wellner [2009] with $k = 2$.

Corollary 5.4. *Suppose Assumption 1 holds at* $x_0 = m$ *or Assumption 2 holds at* $x_0 \neq m$. *Then for any* $0 < C < \infty$,

$$\sup_{t\in[x_0-Cn^{-1/5},x_0+Cn^{-1/5}]} \left|(\widehat{\varphi}_n^0)'(t) - \varphi_0'(x_0)\right| = O_p(n^{-1/5}), \tag{5.7}$$

where $(\widehat{\varphi}_n^0)'$ *denotes either the right or left derivative, and*

$$\sup_{t\in[x_0-Cn^{-1/5},x_0+Cn^{-1/5}]} \left|\widehat{\varphi}_n^0(t) - \varphi_0(x_0) - (t-x_0)\varphi_0'(x_0)\right| = O_p(n^{-2/5}). \tag{5.8}$$

We may replace the intervals $[x_0 - Cn^{-1/5}, x_0 + Cn^{-1/5}]$ *by* $[\xi_n - Cn^{-1/5}, \xi_n + Cn^{-1/5}]$ *for any* $\xi_n \to m$. *Then the random variables implied by the* O_p *upper bounds depend on* C *but not on* ξ_n.

Proof. Equation (5.7) follows from (5.2) and

$$\sup_{|u|\le C} \left|(\widehat{\varphi}_n)'(x_0 + n^{-1/5}u) - \varphi_0'(x_0)\right| = O_p(n^{-1/5}),$$

which is Lemma 4.5 on page 1319 of Balabdaoui, Rufibach and Wellner [2009]. Similarly, (5.4) and the same Lemma 4.5 yield (5.8). □

5.2. The limit processes, unconstrained

In Section 5.4 and Section 5.5 we will present the limit distribution for $\widehat{f}_n(m)$ (and $\widehat{\varphi}_n(m)$) and for $\widehat{f}_n^0(m)$ (and $\widehat{\varphi}_n^0(m)$), as well as the corresponding derivative estimators at m, under the curvature Assumption 1. For both the unconstrained and the mode-constrained estimators, the limit distributions are not Gaussian, and depend on so-called *invelope* processes of integrated Brownian motion. We now present the invelope process related to the limit distribution for the unconstrained estimators; this process was first presented and studied in Groeneboom, Jongbloed and Wellner [2001a] (and shown to yield the limit distribution in several convex function estimation problems in Groeneboom, Jongbloed and Wellner [2001b]). Let W be a two-sided standard Brownian motion starting at 0 and for any $t \in \mathbb{R}$ let

$$\begin{aligned} X(t) &= W(t) - 4t^3 \text{ and} \\ Y(t) &= \int_0^t W(s)\, ds - t^4. \end{aligned} \tag{5.9}$$

Theorem 5.5 (Groeneboom, Jongbloed and Wellner [2001a])**.** *Let W, X, and Y be as in (5.9). Then there exists an almost surely uniquely defined random continuous function H satisfying the following conditions.*

1. *The function H is everywhere below Y:*
$$H(t) \le Y(t) \quad \text{for all } t \in \mathbb{R}.$$
2. *H has a concave second derivative.*
3. *H satisfies*
$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} (H(t) - Y(t)) d(H^{(3)})(t) = 0.$$

The random variables $H^{(2)}(0)$ and $H^{(3)}(0)$ give the universal component of the limit distribution of $\widehat{f}_n(x_0)$ and $(\widehat{f}_n)'(x_0)$; see Theorem 5.8, below.

5.3. The limit processes, mode-constrained

Theorem 5.5 is about a process H, related to the unconstrained concave estimation problem; in the constrained estimation problem, instead of having one process we have two, one for the left-hand side of 0 (negative axis) and one for the right-hand side of 0 (positive axis). (Here, 0 corresponds to the mode m, by a translation.) The definitions of the left- and right-hand processes depend on a random starting point for the corresponding integrals involved, which we will eventually denote τ_L and τ_R (this is made clear in (7.57), (7.58), and (7.59), below). To define τ_L and τ_R, we must define rigorously the possible 'bend points' of $\widehat{\varphi}^0$, which may be a complicated Cantor-type set. Further complicating things, we also will define 'bend points' τ_+^0 and τ_-^0, satisfying $\tau_+^0 \le \tau_R$ and $\tau_-^0 \ge \tau_L$, where the inequality may or may not be strict; these bend points arise in (5.18) below.

Theorem 5.6. *Assume H_L, H_R are random processes where $\widehat{\varphi}^0(t) \equiv H_L^{(2)}(t) = H_R^{(2)}(t)$ is concave with argmax occurring at 0. Define the 'bend points' $\widehat{S}^0$ by*

$$(\widehat{S}^0(\widehat{\varphi}^0))^c \equiv (\widehat{S}^0)^c := \left\{ t \in \mathbb{R} : (\widehat{\varphi}^0)^{(2)}(t\pm) = 0 \right\}. \tag{5.10}$$

Next, define

$$\tau_-^0(\widehat{\varphi}^0) \equiv \tau_-^0 = \sup\left\{ t \in \widehat{S}^0 : (\widehat{\varphi}^0)'(t-\varepsilon-) > 0 \text{ for all } \varepsilon > 0 \right\}, \tag{5.11}$$

$$\tau_+^0(\widehat{\varphi}^0) \equiv \tau_+^0 = \inf\left\{ t \in \widehat{S}^0 : (\widehat{\varphi}^0)'(t+\varepsilon+) < 0 \text{ for all } \varepsilon > 0 \right\}, \tag{5.12}$$

$$\tau_L = \sup\left(\widehat{S}^0 \cap (-\infty, 0)\right) \text{ and } \tau_R = \inf\left(\widehat{S}^0 \cap (0,\infty)\right). \tag{5.13}$$

Let W be a standard two-sided Brownian motion with $W(0) = 0$, and for $t \in \mathbb{R}$ let

$$X(t) = W(t) - 4t^3,$$

$$Y_L(t) = \int_t^{\tau_L}\int_u^{\tau_L} dX(v)du \quad \text{and} \quad Y_R(t) = \int_{\tau_R}^t \int_{\tau_R}^u dX(v)du. \tag{5.14}$$

With these definitions, we assume that

1. *$-\infty < \tau_L$ and $\tau_R < \infty$ and*

$$\int_{\tau_L}^{\tau_R} (\widehat{\varphi}^0(v)dv - dX(v)) = 0, \tag{5.15}$$

2.

$$H_L(t) - Y_L(t) \le 0 \text{ for } t \le 0, \tag{5.16}$$

$$H_R(t) - Y_R(t) \le 0 \text{ for } t \ge 0, \tag{5.17}$$

3.

$$\int_{(-\infty,\tau_-^0]} (H_L(u) - Y_L(u)) d(\widehat{\varphi}^0)'(u) = 0 = \int_{[\tau_+^0,\infty)} (H_R(u) - Y_R(u)) d(\widehat{\varphi}^0)'(u). \tag{5.18}$$

Then, H_L and H_R are unique, as are τ_L and τ_R.

Theorem 5.6 shows that processes with the given properties are unique; that they exist will follow from Section 5.5.

If $\widehat{\varphi}^0$ is, in fact, piecewise linear, then τ_-^0 is just the last knot point τ of $\widehat{\varphi}^0$ with $(\widehat{\varphi}^0)'(\tau-) > 0$. By Theorem 23.1 of Rockafellar [1970], a finite, concave function on $\mathbb{R}$ such as $\widehat{\varphi}^0$ has well-defined right- and left-derivatives at all of $\mathbb{R}$; the specification of left- and right- derivatives in the definitions of τ_-^0 and τ_+^0 are for concreteness but not necessary since we consider all $\varepsilon > 0$.

The two sets of knot pairs have different properties; if we replace τ_L, τ_R by τ_-^0, τ_+^0 in (5.15), then that display may not hold; similarly, if we replace τ_-^0, τ_+^0 by τ_L, τ_R in (5.18), then that display may not hold. The following lemma holds for τ_-^0, τ_+^0 but not necessarily for τ_L, τ_R.

Lemma 5.7. *With the definitions and assumptions as in Theorem 5.6,*

$$(\widehat{\varphi}^0)'(t) = 0 \text{ for } t \in (\tau_-^0, \tau_+^0). \tag{5.19}$$

5.4. Pointwise limit theory, unconstrained

The limit distribution of the unconstrained estimators and their derivatives, $\widehat{f}_n$, $\widehat{\varphi}_n$, $(\widehat{f}_n)'$, and $(\widehat{\varphi}_n)'$, is given by the following theorem.

Theorem 5.8 (Theorem 2.1, page 1305, Balabdaoui, Rufibach and Wellner [2009])**.** *Assume that $X_1, \ldots, X_n$ are i.i.d. from $f_0 \in \mathcal{P}$, that f_0 is twice continuously differentiable at $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}$, that $f_0(x_0) > 0$, and that $f_0''(x_0) > 0$. Let H be as in Theorem 5.5 and let $\widehat{\varphi} \equiv H''$. Then*

$$\begin{pmatrix} n^{2/5}(\widehat{f}_n(x_0) - f_0(x_0)) \\ n^{1/5}(\widehat{f}_n'(x_0) - f_0'(x_0)) \end{pmatrix} \xrightarrow{d} \begin{pmatrix} c(x_0,\varphi_0)\widehat{\varphi}(0) \\ d(x_0,\varphi_0)\widehat{\varphi}'(0) \end{pmatrix},$$

and

$$\begin{pmatrix} n^{2/5}(\widehat{\varphi}_n(x_0) - \varphi_0(x_0)) \\ n^{1/5}(\widehat{\varphi}_n'(x_0) - \varphi_0'(x_0)) \end{pmatrix} \xrightarrow{d} \begin{pmatrix} C(x_0,\varphi_0)\widehat{\varphi}(0) \\ D(x_0,\varphi_0)\widehat{\varphi}'(0) \end{pmatrix},$$

where the constants are

$$c(x_0,\varphi_0) = \left(\frac{f_0(x_0)^3|\varphi_0^{(2)}(x_0)|}{4!}\right)^{1/5}, \qquad d(x_0,\varphi_0) = \left(\frac{f_0(x_0)^4|\varphi_0^{(2)}(x_0)|^3}{(4!)^3}\right)^{1/5}$$

$$C(x_0,\varphi_0) = \left(\frac{|\varphi_0^{(2)}(x_0)|}{f_0(x_0)^2 4!}\right)^{1/5}, \qquad D(x_0,\varphi_0) = \left(\frac{|\varphi_0^{(2)}(x_0)|^3}{f_0(x_0)(4!)^3}\right)^{1/5}.$$

5.5. Pointwise limit theory, mode-constrained

The limit distribution of the mode-constrained estimators at a point x_0 depends on whether $x_0 = m$ or $x_0 \neq m$. In the latter case the asymptotics are the same as the unconstrained estimator, but in the former case they depend on the mode-constrained limit process.

Theorem 5.9. *Let constants $c(x_0,\varphi_0), d(x_0,\varphi_0), C(x_0,\varphi_0)$, and $D(x_0,\varphi_0)$ be as given in Theorem 5.8.*

(A) Let Assumption 1 hold. Let $\widehat{\varphi}^0$ be as in Theorem 5.6. Then

$$\begin{pmatrix} n^{2/5}(\widehat{f}_n^0(m) - f_0(m)) \\ n^{1/5}((\widehat{f}_n^0)'(m) - f_0'(m)) \end{pmatrix} \xrightarrow{d} \begin{pmatrix} c(m,\varphi_0)\widehat{\varphi}^0(0) \\ d(m,\varphi_0)(\widehat{\varphi}^0)'(0) \end{pmatrix}, \tag{5.20}$$

and

$$\begin{pmatrix} n^{2/5}(\widehat{\varphi}_n^0(m) - \varphi_0(m)) \\ n^{1/5}((\widehat{\varphi}_n^0)'(m) - \varphi_0'(m)) \end{pmatrix} \xrightarrow{d} \begin{pmatrix} C(m,\varphi_0)\widehat{\varphi}^0(0) \\ D(m,\varphi_0)(\widehat{\varphi}^0)'(0) \end{pmatrix}. \tag{5.21}$$

(B) Let Assumption 2 hold. Let H be as in Theorem 5.5 and let $\widehat{\varphi} \equiv H''$. Then

$$\begin{pmatrix} n^{2/5}(\widehat{f}_n^0(x_0) - f_0(x_0)) \\ n^{1/5}((\widehat{f}_n^0)'(x_0) - f_0'(x_0)) \end{pmatrix} \xrightarrow{d} \begin{pmatrix} c(x_0,\varphi_0)\widehat{\varphi}(0) \\ d(x_0,\varphi_0)\widehat{\varphi}(0) \end{pmatrix},$$

and

$$\begin{pmatrix} n^{2/5}(\widehat{\varphi}_n^0(x_0) - \varphi_0(x_0)) \\ n^{1/5}((\widehat{\varphi}_n^0)'(x_0) - \varphi_0'(x_0)) \end{pmatrix} \xrightarrow{d} \begin{pmatrix} C(x_0,\varphi_0)\widehat{\varphi}(0) \\ D(x_0,\varphi_0)\widehat{\varphi}'(0) \end{pmatrix}.$$

Theorems 5.8 and 5.9 follow from a more general theorem about the estimators not just at x_0 but in local $n^{-1/5}$ neighborhoods of x_0. This theorem is stated in Section 7.3.3, and is the version from which we can derive the limit distribution of the likelihood ratio statistic $2\log\lambda_n$ studied in Doss and Wellner [2016b].

6. Outlook and further problems

(a) Here we have studied the mode-constrained MLE $\widehat{f}_n^0$ when the true distribution has a density f in $\mathcal{P}_m$ (with m correctly specified) or in the class $\mathcal{P}$ of log-concave densities on $\mathbb{R}$. Dümbgen, Samworth and Schuhmacher [2011] consider the unconstrained log-concave density estimators $\widehat{f}_n$ on $\mathbb{R}^d$ and show that they have remarkable robustness and stability properties even if the true measure P governing the data does not have a density and is not log-concave under very general conditions ($E_P(|X|) < \infty$ and the interior of the convex support of P is not empty). It is of interest to extend their results to: (i) the mode-constrained MLE $\widehat{f}_n^0$ on $\mathbb{R}$ studied here; (ii) natural generalizations of $\widehat{f}_n^0$ studied here to $\mathbb{R}^d$. We state a set of three theorems accomplishing this extension in Doss and Wellner [2016b]; see Theorems 7.8, 7.9, and 7.10 in Subsection 7.4 of that paper.

(b) Our main motivation for the study of $\widehat{f}_n^0$ given here has been the likelihood ratio tests and confidence intervals for the mode introduced in Doss and Wellner [2016b]. But the constrained estimators may be of interest for the study of semiparametric two- and $k-$sample problems with (constrained) log-concave errors. For example suppose that $X_1,\ldots,X_m$ are i.i.d. with $X_i \stackrel{d}{=} \mu + \varepsilon_i$, $i = 1,\ldots,m$, while $Y_1,\ldots,Y_n$ are i.i.d. with $Y_j \stackrel{d}{=} \nu + \delta_j$ where $\mu,\nu \in \mathbb{R}$ and ε_i, δ_j are i.i.d. with log-concave density f with mode at 0. Other variants of this problem might involve constraining f to be log-concave with mean or median at 0 rather than mode at 0. Constraining f to be symmetric about its mode of 0 and log-concave, as in Balabdaoui and Doss [2014], is also of interest.

(c) Han and Wellner [2016] studied Rényi divergence estimators $\widehat{f}_n$ of f for the (larger) $s-$concave classes with $-1 < s < 0$. It would be interesting to study the corresponding mode-constrained estimators for these larger classes

and to consider analogues of the likelihood ratio tests and confidence intervals introduced in Doss and Wellner [2016b] for the log-concave setting.

(d) Suppose that f is a log-concave density on $\mathbb{R}^d$ and suppose that we know that the mode of f is at the origin. The unconstrained MLE of f has been studied by Cule, Samworth and Stewart [2010b], Cule and Samworth [2010b], and Dümbgen, Samworth and Schuhmacher [2011]. What is the MLE of f in the constrained model with known mode at the origin? There is the possibility of (multivariate) confidence sets for the mode of a log-concave density f on $\mathbb{R}^d$ along lines similar to Doss and Wellner [2016b], but the necessary pointwise and local limit theory to justify these potential methods is, at present, not even available for the unconstrained estimators.

(e) Can the theory and methodology developed here and in the companion paper Doss and Wellner [2016b] be extended to other convexity-based settings for inference about the location of maxima or minima? For instance, let $Y_i = m(x_i) + \varepsilon_i$ where ε_i are mean zero i.i.d. observations and x_i are fixed numbers in $\mathbb{R}$. If we assume m to be convex, then much is known about the least-squares estimator $\widehat{m}_n$ of m; see, e.g., Hildreth [1954], Hanson and Pledger [1976], Mammen [1991], and Groeneboom, Jongbloed and Wellner [2001a,b]. Can an argmin-constrained estimator $\widehat{m}_n^0$ be developed, in analogy with the estimator $\widehat{f}_n^0$, and used to develop likelihood ratio-based tests and intervals for the location of the minimum of m, in analogy with Doss and Wellner [2016b]? In such a problem, we conjecture that the universal component of the limit distribution of $\widehat{m}_n^0$ at the argmin of m will be the same as that studied in Doss and Wellner [2016b], Theorem 1.1.

(f) Can the techniques used here be applied to form tests and intervals for the *value* (or height) of a log-concave density f_0 rather than argmax? That is, can we develop an estimator $\widehat{g}_n^0$ based on the constraint that the log-concave density f satisfies $f(x_0) = y_0$ for x_0, y_0 fixed, and use $\widehat{g}_n^0$ with the unconstrained estimator $\widehat{f}_n$ to form a likelihood ratio test for $f_0(x_0)$? In such a problem, the universal component of the limit distribution of $\widehat{g}_n^0(x_0)$ is presumably different than that given in Theorem 5.6. What is the limit process governing the limit distribution of $\widehat{g}_n^0(x_0)$?

7. Proofs

7.1. Proofs of finite sample properties

Proofs of Theorems 2.1, 2.2, 2.3 and Corollaries 2.4 and 2.5 may be found in Pal, Woodroofe and Meyer [2007], Rufibach [2006], and Dümbgen and Rufibach [2009]. Here we let $\mathcal{C}_{n,m}$ denote the (random) class of concave functions with knots at the Z_i's and support on $[X_{(1)}, X_{(n)}]$, and let $\mathcal{K}_{n,m}$ denote the class of concave functions φ with knots at the Z_i's and where e^{φ} is a density with support $[X_{(1)}, X_{(n)}]$.

Proof of Theorem 2.6. The proof of existence is similar to the unconstrained case, i.e. Theorem 2.1 Dümbgen and Rufibach [2009]. It is clear that the solution is piecewise linear with knots at the Z_i's. This follows from comparing any two concave functions with the same values at the data points, because the line between $\widehat{\varphi}_n^0(Z_i)$ and $\widehat{\varphi}_n^0(Z_{i+1})$ falls below any other concave function with the same values. Analogously, $\widehat{\varphi}_n^0$ is flat either directly to the left of the mode or directly to the right of the mode as long as the mode is not a data point. To see that the MLE exists, we show that as the norm of φ, thought of as a vector in $\mathbb{R}^N$, goes to infinity, the value of the criterion function Ψ_n given by (2.3) goes to $-\infty$. We identify φ with $v = v_\varphi \equiv \{\varphi(Z_i)\}_1^N$ and write $\Psi_n(v)$ and $\Psi_n(\varphi)$ interchangeably. Now note that Ψ_n thought of as a function on $\mathbb{R}^N$ is continuous. The cone $\mathcal{C}_{n,m}$ is a closed set because pointwise limits of concave functions are concave, and the mode of the limit will still be m. Thus if we consider Ψ_n restricted to a bounded subset of $\mathcal{K}_{n,m}$, then that subset is compact, and continuous functions achieve maxima on compact sets, so the MLE exists.

The method now is to show that as the distance from the origin to v goes to infinity, then $\Psi_n(v)$ goes to $-\infty$. Consider a sequence $\{v_j\}$, which has limit coordinates $\gamma = (\gamma_1, \ldots, \gamma_N)$, which might be $\pm\infty$, and let φ_γ be the corresponding piecewise linear function. If the mode is equal to one of the X_i's then the proof in Rufibach (2006) holds verbatim. Thus, we assume that none of the X_i are equal to the mode. In that case, as argued above, we can assume that φ_γ has a flat modal region on $[Z_i, Z_j]$ for some $i < j$. But then for the density to integrate to 1, we must have $\varphi_\gamma(m) \leq \log(1/(Z_j - Z_i))$. Since m is the mode of e^{φ_γ}, this means no coordinate of γ is positive infinity. And, since no coordinate is positive infinity, we can conclude that if one of the limiting coordinates is negative infinity then $\Psi_n(\gamma) = -\infty$. Finally, if $\widehat{\varphi}_n$ maximizes Ψ_n over $\mathcal{K}_m$ then it maximizes Ψ_n over $\mathcal{C}_m$: for $t \in \mathbb{R}$, and $\phi \in \mathcal{K}_m$, then $\Psi_n(\phi + t) = \int (\phi(x) + t) d\mathbb{F}_n(x) - \int e^{\phi(x)+t} dx$ and this equals

$$\int \phi(x)\, d\mathbb{F}_n(x) + t - e^t = \Psi_n(\phi) - (e^t - t - 1) < \Psi_n(\phi).$$

Uniqueness follows because Ψ_n is strictly concave. □

Proof of Theorem 2.8. This follows from the fact that $D_\Delta \Psi_n(\widehat{\varphi}_n^0) = \int \Delta d\mathbb{F}_n - \int \Delta d\widehat{F}_n^0$. This is because

$$\begin{aligned} D_\Delta \Psi_n(\phi) &= \lim_{\varepsilon \to 0+} \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \left(\Psi_n(\varphi + \varepsilon\Delta) - \Psi_n(\varphi)\right) \\ &= \int \frac{\partial}{\partial \varepsilon} \left(\varphi(x) + \varepsilon\Delta(x)\right)|_{\varepsilon=0} d\mathbb{F}_n(x) - \int \frac{\partial}{\partial \varepsilon} (e^{\varphi(x)+\varepsilon\Delta(x)})|_{\varepsilon=0} dx \\ &= \int \Delta(x) d\mathbb{F}_n(x) - \int \Delta(x) e^{\varphi(x)} dx \end{aligned}$$

which holds for any Δ such that $\varphi + \varepsilon\Delta \in \mathcal{C}_m$ for some positive ε. It is easy to verify that differentiating under the integral sign is allowable. Now as noted above, Ψ_n is strictly concave because $-e^x$ is. In all directions Δ such that

the above derivative is defined, it is necessarily no larger than 0 at $\widehat{\varphi}_n^0$, the maximizer of Ψ_n, and hence (2.4) is necessary. (2.4) is also sufficient because of strict concavity of $\varepsilon \mapsto \Psi_n(\varphi + \varepsilon\Delta)$. Thus, by analysis in one real variable, $\Psi_n(\widehat{\varphi}_n^0)$ is larger than $\Psi_n(\Delta)$ for any concave Δ. □

For a *cone* $C \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ (defined, e.g., on page 13 of Rockafellar [1970]), we say C is *(finitely) generated* by a set $\{b_i \in C : i = 1, \ldots, k < \infty\}$ if for all $c \in C$ we can write $c = \sum_{i=1}^k \alpha_i b_i$ for some nonnegative numbers $\alpha_i \geq 0$. For our first fact, we use the notation $(x)_- = \min(x, 0)$ and $(x)_+ = \max(x, 0)$. The following proposition will be needed to show that Theorem 2.10 follows from Theorem 2.8.

Proposition 7.1. *$\mathcal{C}_{n,m}$ is a convex cone with finite generating set given by*

$$\{(x - Z_i)_-\}_{2 \leq i \leq k} \bigcup \{(Z_i - x)_-\}_{k \leq i \leq N-1} \bigcup \{\pm 1\}.$$

Proof. It is clear that $\mathcal{C}_{n,m}$ is a cone because concavity and the mode are preserved under positive scaling. For $\varphi \in \mathcal{C}_{n,m}$, with $\varphi'(Z_i-) = \sum_{j=i}^k a_j$ for $i \leq k$, with, $\varphi'(Z_i+) = \sum_{j=k}^i b_j$ for $i \geq k$, and with $\varphi(m) = C$, we can write $\varphi(x) = C + \sum_{i=2}^k a_i(x - Z_i)_- + \sum_{i=k}^{n-1} b_i(Z_i - x)_-$. □

Now we are ready to prove Theorem 2.10.

Proof of Theorem 2.10. First we assume $\widehat{\varphi}_n^0$ is the MLE and use (2.4) to show that (2.6) and (2.7) hold. Using the generating functions described in Proposition 7.1 as our Δ yields equations (2.6) and (2.7) via integration by parts. That is, for $t \leq m$, we choose $\Delta(x) = (x - t)_-$ (which is concave with m as a mode). Then integration by parts yields $-\int_{X_{(1)}}^t F(x)dx = \int_{X_{(1)}}^{X_{(n)}} (x - t)_- dF(x)$, by Lemma 8.1 (B), for F equal to either $\mathbb{F}_n$ or $\widehat{F}_n^0$ since $\mathbb{F}_n(X_{(1)}-) = \widehat{F}_n^0(X_{(1)}-) = 0$. Thus, by our initial characterization (2.4), we get (2.6). Similarly, for $t \geq m$, let $\Delta(x) = (t - x)_-$; this yields

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left(t - X_{(n)}\right) \mathbb{F}_n(X_{(n)}) - \int_t^{X_{(n)}} \mathbb{F}_n(x) d(-x) \\
&= \int (t - x)_- \, d\mathbb{F}_n(x) \leq \int (t - x)_- \, d\widehat{F}_n^0(x) \\
&= \left(t - X_{(n)}\right) \widehat{F}_n^0(X_{(n)}) - \int_t^{X_{(n)}} \widehat{F}_n^0(x) d(-x),
\end{aligned}$$

and, recalling that we have already shown $\widehat{F}_n^0(X_{(n)}) = 1$, this is equivalent to

$$-\int_t^{X_{(n)}} \mathbb{F}_n(x) d(-x) \leq -\int_t^{X_{(n)}} \widehat{F}_n^0(x) d(-x),$$

so we have (2.7). We get equality at some knot points also: set $\Delta(x) = (x - b)_+$ where $b \geq m$ is any RK. Then, by the definition of a RK, Δ is an allowable

perturbation because $\widehat{\varphi}_n^0(b+) - \widehat{\varphi}_n^0(b-) > 0$ so for some δ small enough, $\widehat{\varphi}_n^0 + \delta\Delta$ is still concave with mode at m. Using this Δ we get

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{F}_n(X_{(n)})\left(X_{(n)} - b\right) - 0 - \int_b^{X_{(n)}} \mathbb{F}_n(x)dx \\
&= \int_{X_{(1)}}^{X_{(n)}} (x-b)_+ d\mathbb{F}_n(x) \le \int_{X_{(1)}}^{X_{(n)}} (x-b)_+ d\widehat{F}_n^0(x) \\
&= \widehat{F}_n^0(X_{(n)})\left(X_{(n)} - b\right) - 0 - \int_b^{X_{(n)}} \widehat{F}_n^0(x)dx,
\end{aligned}$$

so that $\int_b^{X_{(n)}} \mathbb{F}_n(x)dx \ge \int_b^{X_{(n)}} \widehat{F}_n^0(x)dx$, and thus for any $b \ge m$ that is a RK we have the inequality both ways, $\int_b^{X_{(n)}} \mathbb{F}_n(x)dx = \int_b^{X_{(n)}} \widehat{F}_n^0(x)dx$. (Note that, for instance, if the slope to the left of m is 0, then $\widehat{\varphi}_n^0(x) + \varepsilon\,(m-x)_+$ does not have m as a mode for any ε. This is why we divide into the cases of LK and RK). We have thus shown that (2.6) and (2.7) hold with the appropriate equalities, so are done with this implication.

Now we will show the reverse implication. We assume (2.6) and (2.7) hold and consider Δ with support $[X_{(1)}, X_{(n)}]$ and piecewise linear with knots at the Z_i. These are all the Δ's we need to consider, since the rest were ruled out previously by elementary considerations. We also need $\widehat{\varphi}_n^0 + \varepsilon\Delta$ to be concave with mode m. Such Δ's are not necessarily concave because they can have positive changes in slope at knots of $\widehat{\varphi}_n^0$. Between two knots they must have only negative changes. Now, we do not know if m will be a NK or a LK or a RK, so we argue by cases. If m is a knot for $\widehat{\varphi}_n^0$ in one direction, without loss of generality, we can say that m is a RK and we have $\int_m^c \mathbb{F}_n(x)dx = \int_m^c \widehat{F}_n^0(x)dx$ for any $c > m$ that is also a knot. Recall that we have defined the indices $1 = j_1, \ldots, j_{l^0} = N$ so that Z_{j_i} are the knots. The key to the proof is to write

$$\Delta'(r-) = \sum_{i=2}^{l} -C_i 1_{[Z_{j_i-1} < r \le Z_{j_i}]} + \sum_{j=j_{i-1}+1}^{j_i} \beta_j 1_{[Z_{j_i-1} < r \le Z_j]} \tag{7.1}$$

with $\beta_j \ge 0$ and all $C_i \ge 0$. In this hypothesized scenario where m is a RK, we may assume m is not also a left-knot (otherwise m is simply a knot and $\widehat{\varphi}_n^0$ coincides with the unconstrained MLE and the characterization of the unconstrained MLE in [Dümbgen and Rufibach, 2009] implies we are done). This forces $C_p = 0$ (which refers to the interval $(Z_{j_p-1}, m = Z_{j_p}]$). We thus have

$$\begin{aligned}
\int \Delta d\mathbb{F}_n &= \Delta(X_{(n)}) - \left[\sum_{i=2}^{l} -C_i \int_{Z_{j_i-1}}^{Z_{j_i}} \mathbb{F}_n(x)\,dx + \sum_{j=j_{i-1}+1}^{j_i} \beta_j \int_{Z_{j_i-1}}^{Z_j} \mathbb{F}_n(x)\,dx\right] \\
&\le \Delta(X_{(n)}) - \left[\sum_{i=2}^{l} -C_i \int_{Z_{j_i-1}}^{Z_{j_i}} \widehat{F}_n^0(x)\,dx + \sum_{j=j_{i-1}+1}^{j_i} \beta_j \int_{Z_{j_i-1}}^{Z_j} \widehat{F}_n^0(x)\,dx\right] \\
&= \int \Delta d\widehat{F}_n^0
\end{aligned}$$

as desired, where the inequality follows from noting that

$$-\beta_j \int_{Z_{j_i-1}}^{Z_j} \mathbb{F}_n(x)dx \leq -\beta_j \int_{Z_{j_i-1}}^{Z_j} \widehat{F}_n^0(x)dx$$

by assumption and because $\beta_j \geq 0$. We also have

$$C_i \int_{Z_{j_i-1}}^{Z_{j_i}} \mathbb{F}_n\left(x\right)dx = C_i \int_{Z_{j_i-1}}^{Z_{j_i}} \widehat{F}_n^0\left(x\right)dx$$

for all i except for $i = p$, by the equality-at-knots assumption. However, for $i = p$, we have $C_i = 0$. An analogous argument holds for the case where m is an LK and for the case where m is neither an LK nor an RK. □

Proof of Corollary 2.12. For $i \neq k$, define the function

$$D_i(z) := \int_{Z_i}^{z} \left(\mathbb{F}_n(x) - \widehat{F}_n^0(x)\right)dx.$$

Then we have $D_i(z) \geq 0$ and $D_i(Z_i) = 0$, so Z_i is a minimum and is an integral of a function which is continuous for small intervals to the left and right of Z_i. (Note that for $z < Z_i$, $D\left(z\right) = \int_{Z_i}^{z} \left(\mathbb{F}_n(x) - \widehat{F}_n^0(x)\right)dx = -\int_{z}^{Z_i} \left(\mathbb{F}_n(x) - \widehat{F}_n^0(x)\right)dx \geq 0$). So using the Fundamental Theorem of Calculus for (right- and left-) continuous functions, we see that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{F}_n(Z_i+) - \widehat{F}(Z_i+) &= \lim_{h\downarrow 0} \frac{\int_{Z_i}^{Z_i+h} \left(\mathbb{F}_n(x) - \widehat{F}_n^0(x)\right)dx}{h} \geq 0 \\ \widehat{F}_n^0(Z_i-) - \mathbb{F}_n(Z_i-) &= \lim_{h\downarrow 0} \frac{-\int_{Z_i-h}^{Z_i} \left(\mathbb{F}_n(x) - \widehat{F}(x)\right)dx}{h} \geq 0. \end{aligned} \tag{7.2}$$

Noting that $\widehat{F}_n^0$ is continuous and $\mathbb{F}_n(Z_i-) = \mathbb{F}_n(Z_i) - 1/n$ finishes the proof. □

Proof of Proposition 2.13. By the characterization given in Equation (1.1) on page 1301 of Balabdaoui, Rufibach and Wellner [2009] for the unconstrained log-concave MLE and by our Theorem 2.10, we can say that for $i < 0$,

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\tau_{n,i}} (\mathbb{F}_n(u) - \widehat{F}_n^0(u))du \geq 0 = \int_{-\infty}^{\tau_{n,i}} (\mathbb{F}_n(u) - \widehat{F}_n^0(u))du$$

and

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\tau^0_{n,i}} (\mathbb{F}_n(u) - \widehat{F}_n^0(u))du \geq 0 = \int_{-\infty}^{\tau^0_{n,i}} (\mathbb{F}_n(u) - \widehat{F}_n^0(u))du,$$

where we may allow $\tau^0_{n,i} = m$ $(i = 0)$ if m is a LK. Thus we conclude that for all $i < 0$ we have both

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\tau_{n,i}} (\widehat{F}_n^0(u) - \widehat{F}_n(u))du \leq 0$$

and

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\tau^0_{n,i}} (\widehat{F}^0_n(u) - \widehat{F}_n(u))du \geq 0.$$

Let $\hat{D}_n(x) = \widehat{F}^0_n(u) - \widehat{F}_n(u)$ and $\hat{C}_n(x) = \int_{-\infty}^x \hat{D}_n(u)du$. For $i_1, i_2, i_3 < 0$ and $i_4 \leq 0$, with equality allowed only if m is a LK, let $\tau_{n,i_1} \leq \tau^0_{n,i_2} < \tau_{n,i_3} \leq \tau^0_{n,i_4}$. Because $\hat{C}_n(\tau_{n,i_1}) \leq 0$ and $\hat{C}_n(\tau^0_{n,i_2}) \geq 0$, the intermediate value theorem implies there exists a point $x_1 \in [\tau_{n,i_1}, \tau^0_{n,i_2}]$ such that $\hat{C}_n(x_1) = 0$. Similarly, there exists a point $x_2 \in [\tau_{n,i_3}, \tau^0_{n,i_4}]$ such that $\hat{C}_n(x_2) = 0$, and $x_1 < x_2$ since $\tau^0_{n,i_2} < \tau_{n,i_3}$. Then, since $\hat{D}_n$ is continuous so $\hat{C}_n$ is differentiable, the mean value theorem implies that there is a point $x_3 \in (x_1, x_2)$ such that $\hat{D}_n(x_3) = (\hat{C}_n(x_2) - \hat{C}_n(x_1))/(x_2 - x_1) = 0$, i.e. there is a point $x_3 \in (\tau_{n,i_1}, \tau_{n,i_3})$ such that $\widehat{F}^0_n(x_3) - \widehat{F}_n(x_3) = 0$. An analogous argument applies if $\tau^0_{n,i_1} \leq \tau_{n,i_2} < \tau^0_{n,i_3} \leq \tau_{n,i_4}$, and for the corresponding cases where the knots are greater than (or equal to) the mode.

Note that, to allow for the possibility that the inequalities $\hat{C}_n(\tau_{n,i}) \leq 0$ and $\hat{C}_n(\tau^0_{n,i}) \geq 0$ are actually equalities (including the case where $\tau_{n,i} = \tau^0_{n,i}$) we require four knots rather than three. □

Proof of Proposition 2.14. $\widehat{F}^0_n(t) - \widehat{F}_n(t)$ is continuous and differentiable on $\mathbb{R}$, so the conclusion follows from the mean value theorem, as in the previous proposition, because $\widehat{F}^0_n(t) - \widehat{F}_n(t) = \int_{-\infty}^t (\widehat{f}^0_n(u) - \widehat{f}_n(u))du$. □

7.2. Proofs for global consistency

Proof of Theorem 4.1. See Pal, Woodroofe and Meyer [2007] and Seregin and Wellner [2010]. For even stronger results in the multivariate case, see Cule and Samworth [2010a] and Dümbgen, Samworth and Schuhmacher [2011]. □

Proof of Theorem 4.2. This follows neatly from the results of Pal, Woodroofe and Meyer [2007] as noted by Doss [2013b]. It is also a consequence of the stronger result in part A of Theorem 4.7 below. □

Corollary 4.3 follows from Seregin and Wellner [2010], while Corollary 4.4 may be proved via similar methods.

Proof of Theorem 4.6. Part A was proved by Doss and Wellner [2016a]. Dümbgen and Rufibach [2009] established part B. □

Proof of Theorem 4.7. Part A was noted by Doss [2013b]; it follows from arguments similar to those of Doss and Wellner [2016a]. Part B is the main new result in Section 4, and will be used crucially in Doss and Wellner [2016b]. We now indicate the changes to the arguments of Dümbgen and Rufibach [2009] which are needed to prove an analog of Theorem 4.1 of Dümbgen and Rufibach [2009] for $\widehat{\varphi}^0_n$.

Note that our Theorem 4.7 part B is only a partial analogue of Theorem 4.6 part B since we only consider the case $\beta = 2$ and require m to be unique. We

assume $f_0 \in \mathcal{P}_m := \{e^\varphi : \int e^{\varphi(x)}dx = 1,\ \varphi \in \mathcal{C}_m\}$ where for m fixed $\mathcal{C}_m$ is the class of concave, closed, proper functions with m as a maximum. We need to study the allowed 'caricatures' of the Lemmas A.4 and A.5 of Dümbgen and Rufibach [2009], which differ for $\widehat{\varphi}_n^0$ from those for $\widehat{\varphi}_n$. Let $\rho_n \equiv n^{-1}\log n$, and let $\|g\|_\infty^I \equiv \sup_{x\in I}|g(x)|$. Note, we define here a function Δ to be "piecewise linear (with q knots)" to mean that

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathbb{R} \text{ may be partitioned into } q+1 \text{ non-degenerate intervals}\\ &\text{on each of which } \Delta \text{ is linear.}\end{aligned} \tag{7.3}$$

In particular, Δ may be discontinuous. Let $\mathcal{D}_k$ be the family of piecewise linear functions on $\mathbb{R}$ with at most k knots. Let

$$\widehat{M} := \overline{\{x \in \mathbb{R} : (\widehat{\varphi}_n^0)'(x) = 0\}} \qquad \text{and} \qquad \widehat{N} := [\tau_L, \tau_R], \tag{7.4}$$

where τ_L is the greatest knot of $\widehat{\varphi}_n^0$ strictly smaller than m and τ_R is the smallest knot of $\widehat{\varphi}_n^0$ strictly larger than m. Note that $\widehat{M}$, the (closed) modal interval of $\widehat{\varphi}_n^0$, is contained in $\widehat{N}$, and may or may not be strictly contained in $\widehat{N}$. Let $\mathcal{S}_n(\widehat{\varphi}_n^0)$ denote the set of knots of $\widehat{\varphi}_n^0$.

Lemma 7.2. *Let $\widehat{M}$ be as in (7.4). Let $\Delta : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ be piecewise linear in the sense of (7.3), such that*

$$\Delta 1_{\widehat{M}} + (-\infty) \times 1_{\widehat{M}^c} \text{ is concave with mode at } m, \tag{7.5}$$

and assume for each knot q of Δ that one of the following holds:

$$q \in \mathcal{S}_n(\widehat{\varphi}_n^0) \setminus \{m\} \qquad \text{and} \qquad \Delta(q) = \liminf_{x\to q}\Delta(x) \tag{7.6}$$

$$\Delta(q) = \lim_{r\to q}\Delta(r) \qquad \text{and} \qquad \Delta'(q-) \geq \Delta'(q+) \tag{7.7}$$

$$q = m, \Delta(q) = \lim_{r\in\widehat{M}, r\to q}\Delta(r) \qquad \text{and} \qquad \Delta(q) = \liminf_{x\to q}\Delta(x). \tag{7.8}$$

Then

$$\int \Delta d\mathbb{F}_n \leq \int \Delta d\widehat{F}_n^0. \tag{7.9}$$

Note that if m is not a knot of $\widehat{\varphi}_n^0$, so is interior to $\widehat{M}$, then (7.8) implies that Δ must be continuous at m and (7.5) implies that m is a local mode of Δ. If m is, e.g., a right knot of $\widehat{\varphi}_n^0$ so $(\widehat{\varphi}_n^0)'(m+) < 0$, then (7.8) allows Δ to be discontinuous at m but forces $\Delta(m-) \leq \Delta(m+)$.

Proof. We show we can construct a sequence Δ_k converging pointwise to Δ, with $|\Delta_k| \leq |\Delta|$, and such that $\widehat{\varphi}_n^0 + \varepsilon\Delta_k$ is concave with mode at m for small enough ε. We first show this holds on the interval $\widehat{N}$.

If m is not a knot of $\widehat{\varphi}_n^0$ then by (7.5) $\widehat{\varphi}_n^0 + \varepsilon\Delta$ is concave with mode at m on $\widehat{N}$. Now if m is a knot of $\widehat{\varphi}_n^0$, either (7.7) holds or (7.8) holds. In the former case, again for $\varepsilon > 0$ small enough, $\widehat{\varphi}_n^0 + \varepsilon\Delta$ is concave with mode at m on $\widehat{N}$.

Thus assume (7.8) holds. For concreteness, assume m is a left knot of $\widehat{\varphi}_n^0$, so $(\widehat{\varphi}_n^0)'(m-) < 0 = (\widehat{\varphi}_n^0)'(m+)$. For $x \in [m-1/k, m]$ define $\Delta_k(x)$ to be the linear function connecting $\Delta(m)$ to $\Delta(m-1/k)$ for $k = 1, \ldots,$ and let $\Delta_k(x) = \Delta(x)$ for $x \in \widehat{N} \setminus [m-1/k, m]$. Then for k large,

$$\widehat{\varphi}_n^0 + \varepsilon\Delta_k \text{ is concave with mode } m \tag{7.10}$$

on $\widehat{N}$, and $\Delta_k(x)$ is monotonically increasing to $\Delta(x)$ (again, for $k \geq$ some K), by (7.8).

For knots q of Δ with $q \neq m$, similar arguments can be made; one can define $\Delta_k(x)$ such that $|\Delta_k(x)| \leq |\Delta(x)|$ where the knots q_k of Δ_k are either knots of $\widehat{\varphi}_n^0$ or satisfy $\Delta_k'(q_k-) > \Delta_k'(q+)$ so that for $\varepsilon > 0$ small (7.10) holds globally. Thus, by the dominated convergence theorem, and the characterization theorem for $\widehat{F}_n^0$,

$$\int \Delta d\mathbb{F}_n = \lim_{k\to\infty} \int \Delta_k d\mathbb{F}_n \leq \lim_k \int \Delta_k d\widehat{F}_n^0 = \int \Delta d\widehat{F}_n^0.$$

□

For the next lemma, we define for a function $\Delta : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$,

$$W(\Delta) = \sup_{x\in\mathbb{R}} \frac{|\Delta(x)|}{1 \vee |\varphi_0(x)|} \qquad \text{and} \qquad \sigma^2(\Delta) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} \Delta^2(x) dF_0(x).$$

Also, for a point $x \in \mathbb{R}$, let $\tau_+^0(x) = \min S_n(\widehat{\varphi}_n^0) \cap [x, \infty)$ and $\tau_-^0(x) = \max S_n(\widehat{\varphi}_n^0) \cap (-\infty, x]$.

Lemma 7.3. *Let $T = [A, B]$ be a compact subinterval strictly contained in $\{f_0 > 0\}$. Let $\varphi_0 - \widehat{\varphi}_n^0 \geq \varepsilon$ or $\widehat{\varphi}_n^0 - \varphi_0 \geq \varepsilon$ on some interval $[c, c+\delta] \subset T$ with length $\delta > 0$ and suppose $X_{(1)} < c$ and $X_{(n)} > c+\delta$. Suppose $[\tau_-^0(c), \tau_+^0(c+\delta)] \cap \hat{N} = \emptyset$. Then there exists a piecewise linear function Δ with at most three knots, each of which satisfies one of conditions (7.6) or (7.7) and a positive constant $K' = K'(f_0, T)$ such that*

$$|\varphi_0 - \widehat{\varphi}^0| \geq \varepsilon|\Delta|, \tag{7.11}$$

$$\Delta(\varphi_0 - \widehat{\varphi}^0) \geq 0, \tag{7.12}$$

$$\Delta \leq 1, \tag{7.13}$$

$$\int_c^{c+\delta} \Delta^2(x)dx \geq \delta/3, \tag{7.14}$$

$$W(\Delta) \leq K'\delta^{-1/2}\sigma(\Delta). \tag{7.15}$$

Proof. The proof is identical to the proof of Lemma A.5 in Dümbgen and Rufibach [2009]; the condition $[\tau_-^0(c), \tau_+^0(c+\delta)] \cap \hat{N} = \emptyset$ allows us to use identical perturbations for $\widehat{\varphi}_n^0$ that one can use for $\widehat{\varphi}_n$. □

Next, we need an adaptation of the above lemma for the more difficult case where we have to accomodate the modal constraint. We assume here that the length of $\widehat{N}$ is shorter than δ, which will be true with high probability when

we apply the lemma to the case where $\widehat{N}$ is of order $n^{-1/5}$ and δ of order $(\log n/n)^{1/5}$.

Lemma 7.4. *Let $T = [A, B]$ be a compact interval strictly contained in $\{f_0 > 0\}$. Let $\varphi_0 - \widehat{\varphi}_n^0 \geq \varepsilon$ or $\widehat{\varphi}_n^0 - \varphi_0 \geq \varepsilon$ on some interval $[c, c + \delta] \subset T$ with length $\delta > 0$ and suppose that $X_{(1)} < c$ and $X_{(n)} > c + \delta$. Suppose also that $[\tau_-^0(c), \tau_+^0(c + \delta)] \cap \hat{N} \neq \emptyset$ and $|\widehat{N}|$, the length of $\widehat{N}$, is no larger than $\delta/4$, and suppose $T \setminus [c, \infty)$ and $T \setminus (-\infty, c + \delta]$ both contain a knot of $\widehat{\varphi}_n^0$. Then there exists a piecewise linear (in the sense of (7.3)) function Δ with at most 4 knots, satisfying the conditions of Lemma 7.2, and there exists a positive $K' \equiv K'(f_0, T)$ such that*

$$|\varphi_0 - \widehat{\varphi}_n^0| \geq \varepsilon|\Delta|, \tag{7.16}$$

$$\Delta(\varphi_0 - \widehat{\varphi}_n^0) \geq 0, \tag{7.17}$$

$$\Delta \leq 1 \tag{7.18}$$

$$\int_c^{c+\delta} \Delta^2(x)dx \geq \delta/6, \tag{7.19}$$

$$W(\Delta) \leq K'\delta^{-1/2}\sigma(\Delta). \tag{7.20}$$

Proof. We argue by several different cases. We focus only on the cases where $\widehat{N}$ is near to $[c, c+\delta]$ in the sense that we now assume that either $\widehat{N} \cap [c, c+\delta] \neq \emptyset$ or there are no knots of $\widehat{\varphi}_n^0$ between $\widehat{N}$ and $[c, c+\delta]$. In any other case, the proof Lemma A.5 of Dümbgen and Rufibach [2009] applies without modification.

We begin with the cases where $\widehat{\varphi}_n^0 - \varphi_0 \geq \varepsilon$ on $[c, c + \delta]$. There are separate subcases depending on how $\widehat{N}$ relates to $[c, c + \delta]$ and the (non-)existence of other knots in $[c, c + \delta]$. In all cases, we will first verify conditions (7.16)–(7.19) and put off verifying (7.20) until later.

Case 1.1 Assume $\widehat{\varphi}_n^0 - \varphi_0 \geq \varepsilon$ on $[c, c+\delta]$ and $\widehat{N} \subset [c, c+\delta]$. Let $\Delta \in \mathcal{D}_4$ be continuous (and piecewise linear) with knots at c, τ_L, τ_R, and $c + \delta$, and let Δ be equal to -1 on $\widehat{N}$ and 0 on $[c, c + \delta]^c$. Thus Δ satisfies conditions (7.5) and (7.7) of Lemma 7.2. Then $|\Delta| \leq 1$ on $[c, c + \delta]$ and is 0 on $[c, c + \delta]^c$, so (7.16) is satisfied, and so is (7.17). Since Δ is always nonpositive, (7.18) is trivially satisfied. We see that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_c^{c+\delta} \Delta^2(x)dx &\geq \int_0^{x_0} \left(\frac{x}{x_0}\right)^2 dx + \int_{x_0}^{\delta} \left(\frac{\delta - x}{\delta - x_0}\right)^2 dx \\ &= \frac{x_0}{3} + \frac{\delta - x_0}{3} = \frac{\delta}{3}, \end{aligned} \tag{7.21}$$

so (7.19) is satisfied.

The next two cases assume $\widehat{\varphi}_n^0 - \varphi_0 \geq \varepsilon$ on $[c, c+\delta]$ and $\widehat{N} \not\subset [c, c+\delta]$. Recall $\widehat{N} = [\tau_L, \tau_R]$.

Case 1.2 Assume $\widehat{\varphi}_n^0 - \varphi_0 \geq \varepsilon$ on $[c, c + \delta]$ and $\widehat{N} \not\subset [c, c + \delta]$. Additionally, assume there exists $\tau \in S_n(\widehat{\varphi}_n^0) \cap ([c, c+\delta] \setminus \widehat{N})$. We now again let $\Delta \in \mathcal{D}_3 \subset \mathcal{D}_4$

be continuous, now with $\Delta(\tau) = -1$. If $\tau_R < c + \delta$, then set the knots of Δ at $c \vee \tau_R, \tau$, and $c + \delta$, and set Δ to be 0 on $[c \vee \tau_R, c + \delta]^c$. If $\tau_L > c$, then set the knots at c, τ, and $(c + \delta) \wedge \tau_L$ and set Δ to be 0 on $[c, (c + \delta) \wedge \tau_L]^c$. Consider the case where $\tau_R < c + \delta$, and the other case is identical. Since $\widehat{N} \not\subset [c, c + \delta]$ and $|\widehat{N}| \leq \delta/4$, $\tau_R - c < \delta/4$. Again, Δ satisfies conditions (7.5) and (7.7) of Lemma 7.2. Conditions (7.16)–(7.18) can be immediately verified, as before. Condition (7.19) can be verified as in the previous case, replacing δ by $3\delta/4$, since $\tau_R - c < \delta/4$, and this yields

$$\int_c^{c+\delta} \Delta^2(x)dx \geq \delta/4.$$

Case 1.3 Assume $\widehat{\varphi}_n^0 - \varphi_0 \geq \varepsilon$ on $[c, c+\delta]$ and $\widehat{N} \not\subset [c, c+\delta]$. Additionally, assume that $S_n(\widehat{\varphi}_n^0) \cap ([c, c+\delta] \setminus \widehat{N}) = \emptyset$. We define $\tilde{\Delta}$ to be an affine function either with $\tilde{\Delta}(c) = -\varepsilon$ and $\tilde{\Delta}$ nonincreasing or $\tilde{\Delta}(c + \delta) = -\varepsilon$ and $\tilde{\Delta}$ nondecreasing. Thus, $\tilde{\Delta} \leq -\varepsilon$ on $[c, c + \delta]$. We take $\tilde{\Delta}$ to be tangent to $\varphi_0 - \widehat{\varphi}_n^0$ (but this is not essential). Next let $(c_1, d_1) := \{\tilde{\Delta} < 0\} \cap (c_0, d_0)$ where $[c_0, d_0] \supset ([c, c + \delta] \setminus \widehat{N})$ is defined to be the maximal interval on which $\varphi_0 - \widehat{\varphi}_n^0$ is concave, so $\widehat{\varphi}_n^0$ is linear. Define $\Delta \in \mathcal{D}_2 \subset \mathcal{D}_4$ via

$$\Delta(x) := \begin{cases} 0 & x \notin [c_1, d_1], \\ \tilde{\Delta}(x)/\varepsilon & x \in [c_1, d_1]. \end{cases}$$

Now, (7.5) of Lemma 7.2 is seen to be satisfied since Δ is 0 on $\widehat{N}$, and since by definition $\tau_L \neq m \neq \tau_R$, (7.6) is satisfied at c_1 and d_1. Since $\tilde{\Delta}$ is tangent to $\varphi_0 - \widehat{\varphi}_n^0$, condition (7.16) is verified, and (7.17) and (7.18) are also seen to be verified. Condition (7.19) holds easily since in fact $\Delta \leq -1$ on $[c, c + \delta]$.

Case 2 Now assume $\varphi_0 - \widehat{\varphi}_n^0 \geq \varepsilon$ on $[c, c + \delta]$.

Case 2.1 Assume $\widehat{N} \subset (c, c + \delta)$. Then if $c + \delta/2 \leq m \leq c + \delta$ then set $c_0 = \tau_{-1}(c)$, the largest knot of $\widehat{\varphi}_n^0$ not larger than c, set $x_0 = m$, and set $d_0 = \tau_R$. If $c \leq m < c + \delta/2$, set $c_0 = \tau_L$, set $x_0 = m$, and let $d_0 = \tau_1(c + \delta)$, the smallest knot of $\widehat{\varphi}_n^0$ not smaller than $c + \delta$.

Case 2.2 Assume $\widehat{N} \not\subset (c, c+\delta)$. Then $(c, c+\delta) \setminus \widehat{N}$ is an interval, and we set x_0 to be the midpoint of this interval; if $m \geq c + \delta/2$ then set $c_0 = \tau_{-1}(c)$ and and set $d_0 = \tau_1(c + \delta) \wedge \tau_L$. Similarly, if $m < c + \delta/2$, set $c_0 = \tau_{-1}(c) \vee \tau_R$ and set $d_0 = \tau_1(c + \delta)$. Since $|\widehat{N}| \leq \delta/4$, $c_0 - c \leq \delta/4$ and $c + \delta - d_0 < \delta/4$ (where only one of the previous inequalities is relevant, depending on whether $m < c + \delta/4$ or $m > c + 3\delta/4$).

For both Case 2.1 and 2.2 we then define $\Delta \in \mathcal{D}_3 \subset \mathcal{D}_4$ by

$$\Delta(x) := \begin{cases} 0, & x \in [c_0, d_0]^c, \\ 1 + \beta_1(x - x_0) & x \in [c_0, x_0], \\ 1 + \beta_2(x - x_0), & x \in [x_0, d_0], \end{cases} \tag{7.22}$$

where $\beta_1 \geq 0$ is chosen such that if

$$(\varphi_0 - \widehat{\varphi}_n^0)(c_0) \geq 0 \quad \text{then} \quad \Delta(c_0) = 0, \text{ and if} \tag{7.23}$$

$$(\varphi_0 - \widehat{\varphi}_n^0)(c_0) < 0 \quad \text{then} \quad \text{sign}(\Delta) = \text{sign}(\varphi_0 - \widehat{\varphi}_n^0) \text{ on } [c_0, x_0], \tag{7.24}$$

where sign(y) is 1 if $y \geq 0$ and -1 if $y < 0$. Similarly, $\beta_2 \leq 0$ is chosen such that if

$$(\varphi_0 - \widehat{\varphi}_n^0)(d_0) \geq 0 \quad \text{then} \quad \Delta(d_0) = 0, \text{ and if} \tag{7.25}$$

$$(\varphi_0 - \widehat{\varphi}_n^0)(d_0) < 0 \quad \text{then} \quad \text{sign}(\Delta) = \text{sign}(\varphi_0 - \widehat{\varphi}_n^0) \text{ on } [x_0, d_0]. \tag{7.26}$$

That is, Δ is defined to be 1 at x_0 and, if $\varphi_0 - \widehat{\varphi}_n^0$ crosses below 0 on $[c_0, c] \cup [c + \delta, d_0]$ at potential points $\tilde{c}$ or $\tilde{d}$, then Δ crosses below 0 at the same point(s). We note also for future reference in Case 2.1 that if $c + \delta/2 \leq m$ then $(\varphi_0 - \widehat{\varphi}_n^0)(d_0) = 0$ since $d_0 = \tau_R \leq c + \delta$, so we are in case (7.25) and $\Delta(d_0) = 0$. Thus $W(\Delta) = W(\Delta 1_{[c_0, x_0]})$, because we have thus forced $W(\Delta 1_{[x_0, d_0]}) = 1$ (and $1 \leq W(\Delta 1_{[c_0, x_0]})$). Similarly, if $m < c + \delta/2$ then we are in case (7.23), and $W(\Delta) = W(\Delta 1_{[x_0, d_0]})$. Now we check that the conditions of Lemma 7.2 hold.

Case 2.1 (continued) If $m \in \widehat{N} \subset [c, c+\delta]$ then Δ is continuous at m (so (7.8) holds), (7.5) holds, and at c_0 and d_0 (7.6) holds (possibly with one discontinuity) since these are both knots.

Case 2.2 (continued) Note, if $\widehat{N} \not\subset [c, c + \delta]$, then Δ is 0 on $\widehat{N} \supseteq \widehat{M}$: if $\widehat{N} \cap [c, c + \delta] = \emptyset$ then this is immediate (since the endpoint of $\widehat{N}$ is the nearest knot to $[c, c+\delta]$), and if one of τ_L or τ_R lies in $(c, c+\delta)$, then $\varphi_0 - \widehat{\varphi}_n^0$ is greater or equal to ε at that point, so Δ will be 0 at that point. Now (7.6) holds at c_0, d_0, and Δ is 0 on $\widehat{N} \supseteq \widehat{M}$ so (7.8) holds.

Now we check the remaining conditions. Conditions (7.17) and (7.18) hold by construction for both Case 2.1 and 2.2. We check Condition (7.19) holds for the two cases.

Case 2.1 (continued) Define $\Delta_*(x)$ to be the triangle function with $\Delta_*(x_0) = 1$ and $\Delta_*(c) = \Delta_*(c + \delta) = 0$. We assume without loss of generality that $m \geq c + \delta/2$. Then, $\Delta 1_{[c, x_0]} \geq \Delta_* 1_{[c, x_0]}$, so by (7.21), $\int \Delta^2(x)dx \geq \int_c^m \Delta_*^2(x)dx \geq (m - c)/3 \geq \delta/6$.

Case 2.2 (continued) Define Δ_* to be the triangle function with $\Delta_*(x_0) = 1$, $\Delta_*(c_0 \vee c) = 0 = \Delta_*(d_0 \wedge (c + \delta))$, and $\Delta_*(x) = 0$ for $x \notin [c, c + \delta]$. Then again $\Delta 1_{[c_0 \vee c, d_0 \wedge (c+\delta)]} \geq \Delta_* 1_{[c_0 \vee c, d_0 \wedge (c+\delta)]}$. Since $c_0 - c \leq \delta/4$ and $c + \delta - d_0 < \delta/4$, $d_0 \wedge (c+\delta) - (c_0 \vee c) \geq 3\delta/4$. Thus, as in (7.52), $\int_c^{c+\delta} \Delta(x)^2 dx \geq \int_c^{c+\delta} \Delta_*(x)^2 dx \geq \delta/4$.

Next we check (7.16) for both Case 2.1 and 2.2. If $\varphi_0 - \widehat{\varphi}_n^0 \geq 0$ on $[c_0, d_0]$ there is nothing to check (since then $|\Delta| = \Delta \leq 1$). Assume that there is thus a point $\tilde{d}$ with $c + \delta < \tilde{d} < d_0$ such that $\varphi_0 - \widehat{\varphi}_n^0 \leq 0$ on $[\tilde{d}, d_0]$. (An analogous argument holds for a point $\tilde{c} < c$). By construction, $(\varphi_0 - \widehat{\varphi}_n^0)(c + \delta) \geq \varepsilon \geq \varepsilon\Delta(c + \delta) \geq 0$, and $(\varphi_0 - \widehat{\varphi}_n^0)(\tilde{d}) = \varepsilon\Delta(\tilde{d}) = 0$; on $[c + \delta, d_0]$, $\varphi_0 - \widehat{\varphi}_n^0$ is concave by the definition of d_0. Thus, $|(\varphi_0 - \widehat{\varphi}_n^0)'(x+)| \geq \varepsilon|\beta_2|$ for any $x \in [\tilde{d}, d_0]$. Thus $(\varphi_0 - \widehat{\varphi}_n^0)(x) \leq \varepsilon\Delta(x) \leq 0$ for $x \in [\tilde{d}, d_0]$. Thus we have shown (7.16).

Lastly, we check (7.20) in all cases. Note that since T is a compact interval strictly contained in $\{f > 0\}$, there exists a constant C_0 such that $f(x) \geq C_0$ for $x \in T$. Now, in Case 1.1, $W(\Delta) \leq \|\Delta\| = 1$ where $\|\Delta\| = \sup_{x\in\mathbb{R}} |\Delta(x)|$. And we have $\sigma(\Delta)^2 \geq C_0 \int_{\mathbb{R}} \Delta(x)^2 dx \geq C_0\delta/3$ by (7.21). So let $K' \geq (3/C_0)^{1/2}$, and then (7.20) holds.

Similarly, in Case 1.2, $W(\Delta) \leq 1$ and $\sigma(\Delta)^2 \geq C_0\delta/4$ by (7.52), so let $K' \geq (4/C_0)^{1/2}$ and then (7.20) holds.

To handle the remaining cases, we consider $h(x)$ defined by $h(x) = 1_Q(x)(\alpha + \gamma x)$ for $\alpha, \gamma \in \mathbb{R}$ where $Q = [x_0, y_0]$ is a nondegenerate interval, $Q \subseteq T$. We always have

$$W(h) \leq \|h\| \qquad \text{and} \qquad \sigma(h)^2 \geq C_0 \int_{x_0}^{y_0} h(x)^2 dx.$$

Now $\int_{\mathbb{R}} h(x)^2 dx$ is invariant under translations of h, sign changes of h, and replacing h by $h(-x)$. Thus, we assume that $h(y_0) > 0$, by replacing h by $-h$ if necessary. If $\min_{y\in Q} h(y) \geq 0$ then let $[x_0, y_0] = [0, y_0]$, taking $x_0 = 0$ by translation. Otherwise, take $x_0 < 0 < y_0$ and $h(0) = 0$, by translation. Furthermore, we assume $h(y_0) = \|h\|$ by replacing $h(x)$ by $-h(-x)$ if $h(x_0) < -h(y_0) < 0$ (so $h(y_0) > 0$, still), or by $h(-x)$ if $h(x_0) > h(y_0) > 0$. Note that we have forced h to be nondecreasing so $\gamma \geq 0$.

Now if we are in the case $\inf_{y\in Q} h(y) = h(0) = \alpha > 0$ with $x_0 = 0$, then

$$\begin{aligned}\int_0^{y_0} (\alpha + \gamma x)^2 dx &= \frac{1}{3\gamma}\left((\alpha + \gamma y_0)^3 - \alpha^3\right) \\ &= \frac{1}{3} y_0 \left((\alpha + \gamma y_0)^2 + \alpha(\alpha + \gamma y_0) + \alpha^2\right) = \frac{1}{3}(y_0 - x_0)\|h\|^2,\end{aligned}$$

since $\|h\| = \alpha + \gamma y_0$ in this case. If we are in the case $h(x_0) < 0 < h(y_0)$ with $x_0 < 0 < y_0$, then

$$\int_{x_0}^{y_0} (\gamma x)^2 dx = \frac{\gamma^2}{3} y_0^3 - \frac{\gamma^2}{3} x_0^3 = \frac{1}{3}(y_0 - x_0)\gamma^2(y_0^2 - y_0 x_0 + x_0^2) \geq \frac{1}{3}(y_0 - x_0)\|h\|^2$$

since $\|h\|^2 = \gamma^2 y_0^2$ in this case. Thus, by (7.53),

$$\left(\frac{3}{C_0(y_0 - x_0)}\right)^{1/2} \sigma(h) \geq \|h\|. \tag{7.27}$$

Now we apply these computations to the remaining cases. In Case 1.3, Δ is of the form of h defined above and the corresponding x_0, y_0 satisfy $y_0 - x_0 \geq 3\delta/4$ since $[c_1, d_1] \supseteq [c, c + \delta] \setminus \widehat{N}$ and $|\widehat{N}| \leq \delta/4$. Note that we can take $Q \subset T$ by the assumption that there are knots of $\widehat{\varphi}_n^0$ above and below $[c, c + \delta]$, and these bound the support of Δ. Thus this case is complete since $\sigma(\Delta)^2 \geq (C_0/3)(y_0 - x_0)W(\Delta)^2$.

For Case 2, Δ equals $h_1 + h_2$ where h_1, h_2 are of the type considered above and have disjoint support, where both supports are contained in T again by the

assumption that $\widehat{\varphi}_n^0$ has knots above and below $[c, c+\delta]$.

Case 2.1 (continued) Assume without loss of generality that $m \geq c + \delta/2$. Then, as noted after display (7.26), $W(\Delta) = W(\Delta 1_{[c_0,x_0]}) \equiv W(h_1)$. For h_1, the corresponding x_0, y_0 satisfy $y_0 - x_0 \geq \delta/2$. Thus,

$$W(\Delta) = W(h_1) \leq \frac{6^{1/2}}{C_0^{1/2}\delta^{1/2}}\sigma(h_1) \leq \frac{6^{1/2}}{C_0^{1/2}\delta^{1/2}}\sigma(\Delta).$$

Case 2.2 (continued) In this case, for both h_1, h_2, the corresponding x_0, y_0 satisfy $y_0 - x_0 \geq 3\delta/8$ (again using $|\widehat{N}| \leq \delta/4$). Thus,

$$W(\Delta) = \max(W(h_1), W(h_2)) \leq \frac{8^{1/2}}{C_0^{1/2}\delta^{1/2}} \max(\sigma(h_1), \sigma(h_2)) \leq \frac{8^{1/2}}{C_0^{1/2}\delta^{1/2}}\sigma(\Delta).$$

This completes the proof. □

Now we complete the proof of Theorem 4.7.B. We treat the case $m \in K$. We can always enlarge K so this holds. Now, since Assumption 1 holds, we know that φ_0 has curvature at m, so that there is an interval K^0 containing m such that $\widehat{\varphi}_n^0$ has knots above and below K^0 with high probability for large n since $\widehat{\varphi}_n^0$ is uniformly consistent by Corollary 4.4. Thus, K^0 satisfies the condition needed for Lemma 7.4. Now suppose that

$$\sup_{t\in K}(\widehat{\varphi}_n^0 - \varphi_0)(t) \geq C\varepsilon_n \quad \text{or} \quad \sup_{t\in[A+\delta_n, B-\delta_n]}(\varphi_0 - \widehat{\varphi}_n^0(t) \geq C\varepsilon_n$$

for some $C > 0$ where $\varepsilon_n = \rho_n^{2/5}$ and $\delta_n = \rho_n^{1/5} = \varepsilon_n^{1/2}$. By Lemma A.3 of Dümbgen and Rufibach [2009] (stated below as Lemma 7.5 for convenience) with $\varepsilon = C\varepsilon_n$, if $C \geq K(2, L)^{-2}$ and n is large it follows that there is a random interval $[c_n, c_n + \delta_n]$ either contained in K^0 or contained in $K \setminus K^0$ on which either $\widehat{\varphi}_n^0 - \varphi_0 \geq C\varepsilon_n/4$ or $\varphi_0 - \widehat{\varphi}_n^0 \geq C\varepsilon_n/4$. In the case $[c_n, c_n + \delta_n] \subset K^0$, then since $\tau_R - \tau_L = O_p(n^{-1/5})$ by Proposition 5.1 (since we assumed $\varphi_0''(m) < 0$) so for n large

$$|\widehat{N}| = \tau_R - \tau_L \leq \delta_n/4 = (\log n/n)^{1/5}/4,$$

so we can find a random function Δ_n with no more than four knots which satisfies the conditions of Lemma 7.4. If $[c_n, c_n + \delta_n] \subset K \setminus K^0$ then we can find a random function Δ_n with no more than three knots satisfying the conditions of Lemma 7.3. Now, calculating as in the proof of Theorem 4.1 of Dümbgen and Rufibach [2009], we can see that for a constant G_0,

$$C^2 \leq \frac{16G_0^2(1+o(1))\varepsilon_n^{-2}\rho_n}{\sigma^2(\Delta_n)} = \frac{16G_0^2(1+o(1))}{\delta_n^{-1}\sigma^2(\Delta_n)} \leq \frac{48G_0^2(1+o(1))}{\inf_{t\in K} f_0(t)}.$$

But if we choose C strictly larger than the constant on the right side we find that the set is empty, and hence has probability 0 on an event with probability increasing to 1.

□

Lemma 7.5 (Lemma A.3, Dümbgen and Rufibach [2009]). *For any $\beta \in [1,2]$ and $L > 0$ there exists a constant $K = K(\beta, L) \in (0,1]$ with the following property: suppose that g and $\hat{g}$ are concave and real-valued functions on $T = [A,B]$ where $g \in \mathcal{H}^{\beta,L}(T)$. Let $\varepsilon > 0$ and $0 < \delta < K \min(B-A, \varepsilon^{1/\beta})$. Then*

$$\sup_{t\in T}(\hat{g}-g)(t) \geq \varepsilon \quad \text{or} \quad \sup_{t\in[A+\delta,B-\delta]}(g-\hat{g})(t) \geq \varepsilon$$

implies that

$$\inf_{t\in[c,c+\delta]}(\hat{g}-g)(t) \geq \varepsilon/4 \quad \text{or} \quad \inf_{t\in[c,c+\delta]}(g-\hat{g})(t) \geq \varepsilon/4.$$

7.3. Proofs for local rates of convergence, limit processes, and limit theory

7.3.1. Proofs for local rates of convergence

Proof of Proposition 5.1. Part A of the proposition follows from Theorem 4.3 of Balabdaoui, Rufibach and Wellner [2009] with $k = 2$ for $\xi_n = m$, and the proof for $\xi_n \to_p m$ holds via the same arguments used by Groeneboom, Jongbloed and Wellner [2001b] to prove their Lemma 4.1, namely the analogous assertion for the ML and LS estimators of a convex decreasing density.

To prove part B of Proposition 5.1, we first consider the case $\xi_n = m$. For ease of notation and without loss of generality, we assume $m = 0$ and abbreviate $\tau^0_{n,+}(0)$ by $\tau^0_{n,+}$ and $\tau^0_{n,-}$ by $\tau^0_{n,-}$. We will argue via a family of perturbations which can be separated into subfamilies, depending on whether 0 is a left-knot (LK), 0 is a right-knot (RK), or 0 is not a knot (NK). If 0 is a one-sided knot (LK or RK), we have different perturbation subfamilies depending on whether $\tau^0_{n,+} > -\tau^0_{n,-}$ or not. We will start with the case in which 0 is a LK and we construct Δ that has the two properties

$$\int_{\tau^0_{n,-}}^{\tau^0_{n,+}} \Delta(t)dt = 0, \tag{7.28}$$

$$\int_{\tau^0_{n,-}}^{0} t\Delta(t)dt = 0. \tag{7.29}$$

Whereas in the unconstrained case construction of such an acceptable perturbation function was straightforward [Balabdaoui, Rufibach and Wellner, 2009], in the constrained case, construction of such a Δ that is an acceptable perturbation (i.e. keeps the mode fixed) is much less straightforward. We consider several cases separately.

Case 1. $\tau^0_{n,+} > -\tau^0_{n,-}$. In this case we define

$$\Delta_{LK,0}(t) = \begin{cases} \frac{\tau^0_{n,+} + m_2 \cdot (-\frac{\tau^0_{n,-}}{4})}{\frac{\tau^0_{n,-}}{4} - \tau^0_{n,-}} \cdot (t - \tau^0_{n,-}), & \tau^0_{n,-} \le t \le \frac{\tau^0_{n,-}}{4} \\ \tau^0_{n,+} + m_2 \cdot (-t), & \frac{\tau^0_{n,-}}{4} \le t \le 0 \\ (\tau^0_{n,+} - t), & 0 \le t \le \tau^0_{n,+} \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \tag{7.30}$$

where

$$m_2 := m_2(\tau^0_{n,-}, \tau^0_{n,+}) = \left(\frac{-9 - 3\frac{\tau^0_{n,+}}{-\tau^0_{n,-}}}{1 - 5\frac{\tau^0_{n,+}}{-\tau^0_{n,-}}} \right) \left(\frac{\tau^0_{n,+}}{-\tau^0_{n,-}} \right).$$

This function has integral

$$\frac{(\tau^0_{n,+})(5\tau^0_{n,+} - \tau^0_{n,-})(\tau^0_{n,+} - \tau^0_{n,-})}{2(5\tau^0_{n,+} + \tau^0_{n,-})} \equiv M_{LK,case1}(\tau^0_{n,+} - \tau^0_{n,-}).$$

Case 2: $\tau^0_{n,+} < -\tau^0_{n,-}$. In this case we define

$$\Delta_{LK,0}(t) = \begin{cases} (t - \tau^0_{n,-}), & \tau^0_{n,-} \le t \le \frac{\tau^0_{n,-}}{2} \\ \frac{\tau^0_{n,-}}{2} - \tau^0_{n,-} + m_2 \cdot (\frac{\tau^0_{n,-}}{2} - t), & \frac{\tau^0_{n,-}}{2} \le t \le 0 \\ \left(\frac{-\frac{\tau^0_{n,-}}{2} + m_2 \frac{\tau^0_{n,-}}{2}}{\tau^0_{n,+}} \right) (\tau^0_{n,+} - t), & 0 \le t \le \tau^0_{n,+} \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \tag{7.31}$$

where

$$m_2 := m_2(\tau^0_{n,-}, \tau^0_{n,+}) = \frac{2\tau^0_{n,-} + \tau^0_{n,+}}{2\tau^0_{n,-} - 5\tau^0_{n,+}}$$

is defined so that (7.29) holds. This function has integral

$$\frac{-\tau^0_{n,-}(3\tau^0_{n,+} - \tau^0_{n,-})(\tau^0_{n,+} - \tau^0_{n,-})}{10\tau^0_{n,+} - 4\tau^0_{n,-}} \equiv M_{LK,case2}(\tau^0_{n,+} - \tau^0_{n,-}).$$

Then we define

$$\Delta_{LK,1}(t) = \Delta_{LK,0}(t) - M_{LK} 1_{[\tau^0_{n,-}, \tau^0_{n,+}]}(t), \tag{7.32}$$

where

$$M_{LK} = \frac{(\tau^0_{n,+})(5\tau^0_{n,+} - \tau^0_{n,-})}{2(5\tau^0_{n,+} + \tau^0_{n,-})} 1_{[\tau^0_{n,+} > \tau^0_{n,-}]} + \frac{-\tau^0_{n,-}(3\tau^0_{n,+} - \tau^0_{n,-})}{10\tau^0_{n,+} - 4\tau^0_{n,-}} 1_{[\tau^0_{n,+} \le \tau^0_{n,-}]},$$

is $o_p(1)$ by uniform consistency of $\widehat{\varphi}^0_n$ and is the appropriate shift so that (7.28) holds. Then $\Delta_{LK,0}$ is an acceptable perturbation for $\widehat{\varphi}^0_n$, since we can have

$m_2 > 1$ when 0 is a LK, and $\Delta_{LK,1}$ has the properties (7.28) and (7.29). We also define $\Delta_{RK,1}$ analogously as $\Delta_{LK,1}$, with analogous constant M_{RK}.

Now consider the case in which 0 is not a knot (NK). In this case, because $(\widehat{\varphi}_n^0)'(t) = 0$ for all $t \in (\tau_{n,-}^0, \tau_{n,+}^0)$, we only need Δ to have the property

$$\int_{\tau_{n,-}^0}^{\tau_{n,+}^0} \Delta(t)dt = 0. \tag{7.33}$$

So, if $\tau_{n,+}^0 > -\tau_{n,-}^0$ define

$$\Delta_{NK,0}(t) := \begin{cases} \frac{\tau_{n,+}^0}{-\tau_{n,-}^0}(t - \tau_{n,-}^0), & \text{for } t \in [\tau_{n,-}^0, 0] \\ (\tau_{n,+}^0 - t), & \text{for } t \in [0, \tau_{n,+}^0] \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \tag{7.34}$$

and otherwise define

$$\Delta_{NK,0}(t) := \begin{cases} (t - \tau_{n,-}^0), & \text{for } t \in [\tau_{n,-}^0, m] \\ \frac{m-\tau_{n,-}^0}{\tau_{n,+}^0 - m}(\tau_{n,+}^0 - t), & \text{for } t \in [m, \tau_{n,+}^0] \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}. \tag{7.35}$$

Denote $h_l = \max(\tau_{n,+}^0, -\tau_{n,-}^0)$ and $h_s = \min(\tau_{n,+}^0, -\tau_{n,-}^0)$. We then compute $\int \Delta_{NK,0}(x)dx = \left(h_l(\tau_{n,+}^0 - \tau_{n,-}^0)\right)/2$, so set

$$\Delta_{NK,1}(x) := \Delta_{NK,0}(x) - \frac{h_l}{2} 1_{[\tau_{n,-}^0, \tau_{n,+}^0]}(x), \tag{7.36}$$

so that (7.33) is satisfied. Let

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_0(x) &= \Delta_{RK,0}(x)1_{[m \text{ is RK}]} + \Delta_{LK,0}(x)1_{[m \text{ is LK}]} + \Delta_{NK,0}(x)1_{[m \text{ is NK}]}, \\ M_n &= M_{RK}1_{[m \text{ is RK}]} + M_{LK}1_{[m \text{ is LK}]} + h_l 1_{[m \text{ is NK}]}, \\ \Delta_1(x) &= \Delta_{RK,1}(x)1_{[m \text{ is RK}]} + \Delta_{LK,1}(x)1_{[m \text{ is LK}]} \\ &\quad + \Delta_{NK,1}(x)1_{[m \text{ is NK}]} \\ &= \Delta_0(x) - M_n. \end{aligned} \tag{7.37}$$

Note that M_n is $o_p(1)$ by uniform consistency in a neighborhood of m. We can then use the characterization Theorem 2.8 and Corollary 2.12 to show that

$$\begin{aligned} \int \Delta_1 d(\mathbb{F}_n - F_0) &= \int \Delta_1 d(\mathbb{F}_n - \widehat{F}_n^0) + \int \Delta_1 d(\widehat{F}_n^0 - F_0) \\ &= \int \Delta_0 d(\mathbb{F}_n - \widehat{F}_n^0) - M_n \int_{\tau_{n,-}^0}^{\tau_{n,+}^0} d(\mathbb{F}_n - \widehat{F}_n^0) + \int \Delta_1 d(\widehat{F}_n^0 - F_0) \\ &\le M_n \left| \int_{\tau_{n,-}^0}^{\tau_{n,+}^0} d(\mathbb{F}_n - \widehat{F}_n^0) \right| + \int \Delta_1(x)(\widehat{f}_n^0 - f_0)(x)dx \\ &\le \frac{2M_n}{n} + \int \Delta_1(x)(\widehat{f}_n^0 - f_0)(x)dx. \end{aligned} \tag{7.38}$$

Then Lemma 7.6 yields

$$\left|\int \Delta_1 d(\mathbb{F}_n - F_0)\right| \leq O_p(n^{-4/5}) + \frac{K}{2}h_l^4, \tag{7.39}$$

$$\int \Delta_1(x)(\widehat{f}_n^0 - f_0)(x)dx \leq -Kh_l^4 + o_p(h_l^4),$$

for some $K > 0$ and where we picked ε from Lemma 7.6 to be $K/2$. So, by rearranging (7.38), we have

$$\begin{aligned} K(1+o_p(1))h_l^4 &\leq -\int \Delta_1(x)(\widehat{f}_n - f_0)(x)dx \\ &\leq \frac{2M_n}{n} - \int \Delta_1 d(\mathbb{F}_n - F_0) \leq \frac{2M_n}{n} + \left|\int \Delta_1 d(\mathbb{F}_n - F_0)\right| \\ &\leq O_p(n^{-4/5}) + \frac{K}{2}h_l^4, \end{aligned}$$

and hence

$$(K/2 + o_p(1))h_l^4) \leq O_p(n^{-4/5})$$

which yields $0 \leq h_l = O_p(n^{-1/5})$. Since $\tau_{n,+}^0$ and $-\tau_{n,-}^0$ are both bounded by h_l, we are done for the case $\xi_n = m$.

Extending to the case where $\xi_n \to m$ rather than being fixed and equal to m follows from considering the event $m \in [\tau_{n,-}^0(\xi_n), \tau_{n,+}^0(\xi_n)]$ and its complement separately, and then by showing on the event $m \notin [\tau_{n,-}^0(\xi_n), \tau_{n,+}^0(\xi_n)]$ that $\tau_{n,+}^0(\xi_n) - \tau_{n,-}^0(\xi_n) = O_p(n^{-1/5})$. This is straightforward. □

Proof of Proposition 5.2. First we show (5.2). Let $\tau_{n,i}$ and $\tau_{n,i}^0$ be knots for $\widehat{\varphi}_n$ and $\widehat{\varphi}_n^0$, respectively, for $i = 1, \ldots, 4$ and $j = 1, 2, 3$, and such that they are the first knots satisfying $x_0 + Cn^{-1/5} < \tau_{n,1}$, and $\tau_{n,i} < \tau_{n,i} < \tau_{n,i+1}$ for $i = 1, 2, 3$. These knots exist by consistency of the unconstrained and constrained estimators. Note that as long as n is large enough, regardless of whether $x_0 = m$ or not, all the knots will be on the same side of m. Then by Proposition 2.13, we have points $\tilde{s}_i \in (\tau_{n,i}, \tau_{n,i+1})$, for $i = 1, 2, 3$, such that $\mathbb{F}_n(\tilde{s}_i) = \widehat{F}_n^0(\tilde{s}_i)$. Then by Proposition 2.14 (i.e. the mean value theorem) we have points $s_i \in (\tilde{s}_i, \tilde{s}_{i+1})$ for $i = 1, 2$ such that $\widehat{f}_n(s_i) = \widehat{f}_n^0(s_i)$ and thus $\widehat{\varphi}_n(s_i) = \widehat{\varphi}_n^0(s_i)$. Similarly, there exist $s_{-2} < s_{-1} < x_0 - Cn^{-1/5}$ such that $\widehat{\varphi}_n(s_i) = \widehat{\varphi}_n^0(s_i)$ for $i = -1, -2$. Now, as in the proof of Lemma 4.4 on page 1682 of Groeneboom, Jongbloed and Wellner [2001b], we note that for $t \in [x_0 - Cn^{-1/5}, x_0 + Cn^{-1/5}]$,

$$\begin{aligned} (\widehat{\varphi}_n^0)'(t-) &\geq (\widehat{\varphi}_n^0)'(t+) \geq (\widehat{\varphi}_n^0)'(s_1) \geq \frac{\widehat{\varphi}_n^0(s_2) - \widehat{\varphi}_n^0(s_1)}{s_2 - s_1} \\ &= \frac{\widehat{\varphi}_n(s_2) - \widehat{\varphi}_n(s_1)}{s_2 - s_1} \geq \widehat{\varphi}_n'(s_2-), \end{aligned}$$

and similarly

$$(\widehat{\varphi}_n^0)'(t+) \leq (\widehat{\varphi}_n^0)'(t-) \leq \widehat{\varphi}_n'(s_{-2}+).$$

Using monotonicity of $\widehat{\varphi}_n'$ (again) we note for all $t \in [x_0 - Cn^{-1/5}, x_0 + Cn^{-1/5}]$ that $\widehat{\varphi}_n'(s_{-2}+) \le \widehat{\varphi}_n'(t) \le \widehat{\varphi}_n'(s_2-)$. Thus, taking the derivative to be either the right- or left-derivative, we have shown

$$\widehat{\varphi}'(s_{-2}) \ge (\widehat{\varphi}_n^0)'(t) \ge \widehat{\varphi}_n'(s_2)$$

so that for all $s \in [x_0 - Cn^{-1/5}, x_0 + Cn^{-1/5}]$ we have

$$\widehat{\varphi}_n'(s_{-2}) - \widehat{\varphi}_n'(s) \ge (\widehat{\varphi}_n^0)'(t) - \widehat{\varphi}_n'(s) \ge \widehat{\varphi}_n'(s_2) - \widehat{\varphi}_n'(s).$$

The right- and left-hand sides are $O_p(n^{-1/5})$ by Lemma 4.5 on page 1319 of Balabdaoui, Rufibach and Wellner [2009], which says

$$\sup_{|u| \le 2C} \left| \widehat{\varphi}_n'(x_0 + n^{-1/5}u) - \varphi_0'(x_0) \right| = O_p(n^{-1/5}), \tag{7.40}$$

and so in particular for any $s \in [x_0 - Cn^{-1/5}, x_0 + Cn^{-1/5}]$, both $\widehat{\varphi}_n'(s_2) - \widehat{\varphi}_n'(s)$ and $|\widehat{\varphi}_n'(s_{-2}) - \widehat{\varphi}_n'(s)|$ are $O_p(n^{-1/5})$ by the triangle inequality. Note that we are using Proposition 5.1 here to imply that $s_{\pm 2} \in [x_0 - 2Cn^{-1/5}, x_0 + 2Cn^{-1/5}]$. Thus (5.1) holds and (5.2) follows trivially.

Then (5.4) follows as in the proof of Lemma 4.4 of Groeneboom, Jongbloed and Wellner [2001b], which relies only on having points of closeness or, in our case, equality of $\widehat{f}_n^0$ and $\widehat{f}_n$, from (5.2), and from concavity. Take $C > 0$ and the s_i as above. We know that $\widehat{\varphi}_n^0(s_i) = \widehat{\varphi}_n(s_i)$ and by (5.1) that for any $\varepsilon > 0$ we can fix a $c > 0$ such that with probability greater than $1 - \varepsilon$ for any $t \in [x_0 - Cn^{-1/5}, x_0 + Cn^{-1/5}]$ we have

$$\left| (\widehat{\varphi}_n^0)'(s_i) - (\widehat{\varphi}_n)'(t) \right| \le cn^{-1/5}.$$

Hence for t and s in $[x_0 - Cn^{-1/5}, x_0 + Cn^{-1/5}]$ and n large,

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{\varphi}_n^0(t) &\le \widehat{\varphi}_n^0(s_{-1}) + (\widehat{\varphi}_n^0)'(s_{-1})(t - s_{-1}) \\ &\le \widehat{\varphi}_n(s_{-1}) + \left((\widehat{\varphi}_n)'(s) + cn^{-1/5} \right)(t - s_{-1}) \\ &= \widehat{\varphi}_n(s) + \widehat{\varphi}_n'(\xi)(s_{-1} - s) + \widehat{\varphi}_n'(s)(t - s_{-1}) + cn^{-1/5}(t - s_{-1}). \end{aligned}$$

Note that because $\widehat{\varphi}_n$ is not continuously differentiable, the standard Taylor expansion does not work. However, concavity suffices because if $\widehat{\varphi}_n$ is monotonically decreasing then, taking $y > x$ without loss of generality, $\widehat{\varphi}_n(y) = \widehat{\varphi}_n(x) + \int_x^y \widehat{\varphi}_n'(u)du$ and $\widehat{\varphi}_n'(x)(y - x) \ge \int_x^y \widehat{\varphi}_n'(u)du \ge \widehat{\varphi}_n'(y)(y - x)$, which means we can write $\widehat{\varphi}_n(y) = \widehat{\varphi}_n(x) + m(y - x)$ where $\widehat{\varphi}_n'(x) \ge m \ge \widehat{\varphi}_n'(y)$, i.e. m is in the subdifferential of $\widehat{\varphi}_n$ at some point ξ between x and y. In the inequality above, we abuse notation and just write $\widehat{\varphi}_n'(\xi)$ where we actually mean a value in the subdifferential at some point ξ in the interval of expansion, i.e. $\xi \in (s_{-1}, s)$ in this case. Using (4.16) in Lemma 4.5 on page 1319 of Balabdaoui, Rufibach and Wellner [2009] to say that $\widehat{\varphi}_n'(s_{-1}) - \widehat{\varphi}_n'(s) \le cn^{-1/5}$ with high

probability, and continuing from above, we see that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\widehat{\varphi}_n(s) + \widehat{\varphi}_n'(\xi)(s_{-1} - s) + \widehat{\varphi}_n'(s)(t - s_{-1}) + cn^{-1/5}(t - s_{-1}) \\
&= \widehat{\varphi}_n(s) + (\widehat{\varphi}_n'(\xi) - \widehat{\varphi}_n'(s))(s_{-1} - s) + \widehat{\varphi}_n'(s)(s_{-1} - s) \\
&\qquad + \widehat{\varphi}_n'(s)(t - s_{-1}) + cn^{-1/5}(t - s_{-1}) \\
&\le \widehat{\varphi}_n(s) + \widehat{\varphi}_n'(s)(t - s) + cn^{-1/5}(t - s_{-1}) \\
&\le \widehat{\varphi}_n(s) + \widehat{\varphi}_n'(s)(t - s) + 2Ccn^{-2/5},
\end{aligned}$$

since $\widehat{\varphi}_n'$ is monotone decreasing (so $(\widehat{\varphi}_n'(\xi) - \widehat{\varphi}_n'(s))(s_{-1} - s) < 0$).

Again, let t and s in $[x_0 - Cn^{-1/5}, x_0 + Cn^{-1/5}]$. Now we show the reverse inequality, using the definition of concavity, the definition of s_i, our previously mentioned "Taylor expansion for concave functions," and the fact that

$$\sup_{t,s \in [x_0 - 2Cn^{-1/5}, x_0 + 2Cn^{-1/5}]} |\widehat{\varphi}_n'(t) - \widehat{\varphi}_n'(s)| \le K_\varepsilon n^{-1/5}$$

with probability $1 - \varepsilon$ by Lemma 4.5, page 1319, of Balabdaoui, Rufibach and Wellner [2009].

$$\begin{aligned}
\widehat{\varphi}_n^0(t) &\ge \widehat{\varphi}_n^0(s_{-1}) + \frac{\widehat{\varphi}_n^0(s_1) - \widehat{\varphi}_n^0(s_{-1})}{s_1 - s_{-1}}(t - s_{-1}) \\
&= \widehat{\varphi}_n(s_{-1}) + \frac{\widehat{\varphi}_n(s_1) - \widehat{\varphi}_n(s_{-1})}{s_1 - s_{-1}}(t - s_{-1}) \\
&= \widehat{\varphi}_n(s) + \widehat{\varphi}_n'(\xi_1)(s_{-1} - s) \\
&\qquad + \frac{t - s_{-1}}{s_1 - s_{-1}}\big(\widehat{\varphi}_n(s) + \widehat{\varphi}_n'(\xi_2)(s_1 - s) - \widehat{\varphi}_n(s) - \widehat{\varphi}_n'(\xi_1)(s_{-1} - s)\big) \\
&\ge \widehat{\varphi}_n(s) + \widehat{\varphi}_n'(s)(s_{-1} - s) + (\widehat{\varphi}_n'(\xi_1) - \widehat{\varphi}_n'(s))(s_{-1} - s) \\
&\qquad + \frac{t - s_{-1}}{s_1 - s_{-1}}\big(\widehat{\varphi}_n'(s)(s_1 - s) + (\widehat{\varphi}_n'(\xi_2) - \widehat{\varphi}_n'(s))(s_1 - s) - \widehat{\varphi}_n'(s)(s_{-1} - s)\big) \\
&\ge \widehat{\varphi}_n(s) + \widehat{\varphi}_n'(s)(s_{-1} - s) - 3CK_\varepsilon n^{-2/5} \\
&\qquad + \frac{t - s_{-1}}{s_1 - s_{-1}}\big(\widehat{\varphi}_n'(s)(s_1 - s) - 3CK_\varepsilon n^{-2/5} - \widehat{\varphi}_n'(s)(s_{-1} - s)\big) \\
&\ge \widehat{\varphi}_n(s) + \widehat{\varphi}_n'(s)(s_{-1} - s) + \widehat{\varphi}_n'(s)(t - s_{-1}) - 6CK_\varepsilon n^{-2/5} \\
&\ge \widehat{\varphi}_n(s) + \widehat{\varphi}_n'(s)(t - s) - 6CK_\varepsilon n^{-2/5}.
\end{aligned}$$

We again used the previously described "convex Taylor expansion". Thus we have shown (5.3) which immediately implies (5.4). □

Proof of Proposition 5.3. First we show (5.6), which follows from a Taylor expansion and the analogous property at the log-level:

$$\begin{aligned}
\left|\widehat{f}_n^0(u) - \widehat{f}_n(u)\right| &= \widehat{f}_n(u)\left|\exp\{\widehat{\varphi}_n^0(u) - \widehat{\varphi}_n(u)\} - 1\right| \\
&= \widehat{f}_n(u)e^{\xi_n}\left|\widehat{\varphi}_n^0(u) - \widehat{\varphi}_n(u)\right|,
\end{aligned}$$

and by uniform consistency of $\widehat{f}_n$ and of $\widehat{\varphi}_n$ and $\widehat{\varphi}_n^0$ on compact sets (so that e^{ξ_n} is bounded by, say, 2, with high probability for n sufficiently large), we conclude

$$\sup_{t\in[x_0-Cn^{-1/5},x_0+Cn^{-1/5}]}\left|\widehat{f}_n^0(t)-\widehat{f}_n(t)\right| = O_p(n^{-2/5}),$$

by (5.4). Then to show (5.5), we use (5.6) after writing

$$\begin{aligned}\left|(\widehat{f}_n^0)'(t)-\widehat{f}_n'(t)\right| &= \left|(\widehat{\varphi}_n^0)'(t)\widehat{f}_n^0(t)-\widehat{\varphi}_n'(t)\widehat{f}_n(t)\right| \\ &= \left|(\widehat{\varphi}_n^0)'(t)(\widehat{f}_n^0)(t)-\widehat{f}_n(t))+(\widehat{\varphi}_n^0)'(t)\widehat{f}_n(t)-\widehat{\varphi}_n'(t)\widehat{f}_n(t)\right| \\ &\le \left|(\widehat{\varphi}_n^0)'(t)\right|\left|\widehat{f}_n^0(t)-\widehat{f}_n(t)\right|+\widehat{f}_n(t)\left|(\widehat{\varphi}_n^0)'(t)-\widehat{\varphi}_n'(t)\right|.\end{aligned}$$

Then, since φ_0' is continuous on $[x_0-\delta,x_0+\delta]$ for some $\delta>0$, we can say for some $M_1<\infty$ that with high probability $\sup_{t\in[x_0-\delta,x_0+\delta]}|(\widehat{\varphi}_n^0)'(t)|\le M_1$ for n large enough by Corollary 4.4, and then, similarly, by uniform consistency of $\widehat{f}_n$ from Corollary 4.3, it follows that for some $M_2<\infty$ with high probability $\sup_{t\in[x_0-\delta,x_0+\delta]}|\widehat{f}_n(t)|\le M_2$ for n large enough. Thus for all n large enough, with high probability we have

$$\begin{aligned}&\sup_{t\in[x_0-Cn^{-1/5},x_0+Cn^{-1/5}]}\left|(\widehat{f}_n^0)'(t)-\widehat{f}_n'(t)\right| \\ &\le\ M_2\left|(\widehat{\varphi}_n^0)'(t)-\widehat{\varphi}_n'(t)\right|+M_1\left|\widehat{f}_n^0(t)-\widehat{f}_n(t)\right| = O_p(n^{-1/5})+O_p(n^{-2/5}).\end{aligned}$$

□

Now we proceed with the proof of Proposition 5.1. The following lemma is key.

Lemma 7.6. *We continue with the setup of Proposition 5.1. That is, we define* $h_l=\max(\tau_{n,+}^0-m,m-\tau_{n,-}^0)$, $h_s=\min(\tau_{n,+}^0-m,m-\tau_{n,-}^0)$ *and* Δ_1 *as in* (7.37). *Then for all* $\varepsilon>0$,

$$\left|\int\Delta_1 d(\mathbb{F}_n-F_0)\right|\le\varepsilon h_l^4+O_p(n^{-4/5}) \tag{7.41}$$

and

$$\int\Delta_1(x)(\widehat{f}_n^0-f_0)(x)dx\le-\frac{f_0(0)|\varphi_0''(0)|}{2}Kh_l^4+o_p(h_l^4), \tag{7.42}$$

where $K>0$ *is from Lemma 7.7, and does not depend on* f_0.

Proof. We examine $\int\Delta_1(x)(\widehat{f}_n^0-f_0)(x)dx$ by repeated Taylor expansions, where we let Δ_1 be $\Delta_{LK,1}$ or $\Delta_{NK,1}$, and we will expand at m, which we again take to be 0, without loss of generality. Write $(\widehat{f}_n^0-f_0)=f_0((\widehat{f}_n^0/f_0)-1)=f_0(\exp\{\widehat{\varphi}_n^0-$

$\varphi_0\} - 1)$. Then write $d_n = \widehat{\varphi}_n^0 - \varphi_0$ so we can expand

$$\begin{aligned} \exp(d_n(t)) - 1 &= \sum_{i=1}^{1} \frac{d_n(t)^i}{i!} + e^{\xi_{1,n,t}} \frac{d_n(t)^2}{2!}, \\ f_0(t) &= \sum_{i=0}^{1} \frac{f_0^{(i)}(0) t^i}{i!} + \frac{f_0^{(2)}(\xi_{2,n,t}) t^2}{2!} \end{aligned}$$

for $t \in [\tau_{n,-}^0, \tau_{n,+}^0]$, where $\xi_{1,n,t}$ is between 0 and $d_n(t)$ and $\xi_{2,n,t}$ is between 0 and t. So, writing $\|\cdot\|_\infty$ as the uniform norm over $[\tau_{n,-}^0, \tau_{n,,+}^0]$, we can write

$$\begin{aligned} f_0(t)(e^{d_n(t)} - 1) &= \left(\sum_{i=0}^{1} \frac{(f_0)^{(i)}(0) t^i}{i!} + \frac{(f_0)^{(2)}(\xi_{2,n,t}) t^2}{2!} \right) \left(\sum_{i=1}^{1} \frac{d_n(t)^i}{i!} + e^{\xi_{1,n,t}} \frac{d_n(t)^2}{2!} \right) \\ &= f_0(0) d_n(t) + o_p(\|d_n(t)\|_\infty) \end{aligned}$$

since $f_0(0) > 0$, $f_0^{(i)}$ is continuous and thus bounded on a neighborhood of 0 for $i \in \{0, 1, 2\}$, and, by uniform consistency, $d_n(t)^i$ and t^i both go to 0 uniformly in a neighborhood of 0. Then we examine

$$\int_{\tau_{n,-}^0}^{\tau_{n,+}^0} \Delta_1(t) d_n(t) dt = \sum_{i=0}^{1} \frac{d_n^{(i)}(0)}{i!} \int_{\tau_{n,-}^0}^{\tau_{n,+}^0} t^i \Delta_1(t) dt + \int_{\tau_{n,-}^0}^{\tau_{n,+}^0} \frac{d_n^{(2)}(\xi_{3,n,t})}{2!} t^2 \Delta_1(t) dt \tag{7.43}$$

where $\xi_{3,n,t} \in [\tau_{n,-}^0, \tau_{n,+}^0]$. Note that $d_n^{(2)}(t) = -\varphi_0^{(2)}(t)$, and that since $d_n^{(2)}$ is continuous *at* 0 we can write $d_n^{(2)}(\xi_{3,n,t}) = d_n^{(2)}(0) + \varepsilon_n(t)$ where $\|\varepsilon_n(t)\|_\infty \to_p 0$ since $\tau_{n,+}^0 - \tau_{n,-}^0 \to_p 0$. Now we consider the different possible forms Δ_1 may take.

If 0 is NK, then $(\widehat{\varphi}_n^0)^{(2)}(0) = 0 = \varphi_0'(0)$, so

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{\tau_{n,-}^0}^{\tau_{n,+}^0} \Delta_{NK,1}(t) d_n(t) dt \\ &= \sum_{i=0}^{2} \frac{d_n^{(i)}(0)}{i!} \int_{\tau_{n,-}^0}^{\tau_{n,+}^0} t^i \Delta_{NK,1}(t) dt + \int_{\tau_{n,-}^0}^{\tau_{n,+}^0} \frac{\varepsilon_n(t)}{2!} t^2 \Delta_{NK,1}(t) dt \\ &= -\frac{\varphi_0^{(2)}(0)}{2!} \int_{\tau_{n,-}^0}^{\tau_{n,+}^0} t^2 \Delta_{NK,1}(t) dt + \int_{\tau_{n,-}^0}^{\tau_{n,+}^0} \frac{\varepsilon_n(t)}{2!} t^2 \Delta_{NK,1}(t) dt. \end{aligned} \tag{7.44}$$

Now we show that we get the same expansion if 0 is a LK. Note that for $t \in$

$[0, \tau^0_{n,+}]$, $\widehat{\varphi}^0_n(t) = \widehat{\varphi}^0_n(0)$ and for $t \in [\tau^0_{n,-}, 0]$, $\widehat{\varphi}^0_n(t) = \widehat{\varphi}^0_n(0) + (\widehat{\varphi}^0_n)'(0-)t$. Thus

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{\tau^0_{n,-}}^{\tau^0_{n,+}} \Delta_{LK,1}(t)\widehat{\varphi}^0_n(t)dt &= \int_{\tau^0_{n,-}}^{0} \Delta_{LK,1}(t)\widehat{\varphi}^0_n(t)dt + \int_0^{\tau^0_{n,+}} \Delta_{LK,1}(t)\widehat{\varphi}^0_n(t)dt \\
&= \widehat{\varphi}^0_n(0)\int_{\tau^0_{n,-}}^{0} \Delta_{LK,1}(t)dt + (\widehat{\varphi}^0_n)'(0-)\int_{\tau^0_{n,-}}^{0} t\Delta_{LK,1}(t)dt \\
&\quad + \widehat{\varphi}^0_n(0)\int_0^{\tau^0_{n,+}} \Delta_{LK,1}(t)dt \\
&= 0.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{\tau^0_{n,-}}^{\tau^0_{n,+}} \Delta_{LK,1}(t)d_n(t)dt \\
&= \int_{\tau^0_{n,-}}^{\tau^0_{n,+}} \Delta_{LK,1}(t)\widehat{\varphi}^0_n(t)dt - \int_{\tau^0_{n,-}}^{\tau^0_{n,+}} \Delta_{LK,1}(t)\varphi_0(t)dt \\
&= -\int_{\tau^0_{n,-}}^{\tau^0_{n,+}} \Delta_{LK,1}(t)\varphi_0(t)dt \\
&= -\sum_{i=0}^{2} \frac{\varphi_0^{(i)}(0)}{i!}\int_{\tau^0_{n,-}}^{\tau^0_{n,+}} t^i\Delta_{LK,1}(t)dt + \int_{\tau^0_{n,-}}^{\tau^0_{n,+}} \frac{\varepsilon_n(t)}{2!}t^2\Delta_{LK,1}(t)dt \\
&= -\frac{\varphi_0^{(2)}(0)}{2!}\int_{\tau^0_{n,-}}^{\tau^0_{n,+}} t^2\Delta_{LK,1}(t)dt + \int_{\tau^0_{n,-}}^{\tau^0_{n,+}} \frac{\varepsilon_n(t)}{2!}t^2\Delta_{LK,1}(t)dt. \qquad (7.45)
\end{aligned}$$

Since an analogous statement holds for $\Delta_{RK,1}$, we have shown

$$\int_{\tau^0_{n,-}}^{\tau^0_{n,+}} \Delta_1(t)d_n(t)dt = -\frac{\varphi_0^{(2)}(0)}{2!}\int_{\tau^0_{n,-}}^{\tau^0_{n,+}} t^2\Delta_1(t)dt + \int_{\tau^0_{n,-}}^{\tau^0_{n,+}} \frac{\varepsilon_n(t)}{2!}t^2\Delta_1(t)dt$$

where $\|\varepsilon_n(t)\|_\infty \to_p 0$. Thus

$$\begin{aligned}
\int \Delta_1(x)(\widehat{f}^0_n - f_0)(x)dx &= f_0(0)(1+o_p(1))\int \Delta_1(t)d_n(t) \\
&= f_0(0)(1+o_p(1))^2\frac{-\varphi_0(2)(0)}{2!}\int_{\tau^0_{n,-}}^{\tau^0_{n,+}} t^2\Delta_1(t)dt.
\end{aligned}$$

Lemma 7.7 shows that

$$\int_{\tau^0_{n,-}}^{\tau^0_{n,+}} t^2\Delta_1(t)dt \le -Kh_l^4 \qquad (7.46)$$

which yields (7.42), our desired conclusion:

$$\int_{\tau^0_{n,-}}^{\tau^0_{n,+}} \Delta_1(t)\left(\widehat{f}^0_n - f_0\right)(t)dt \le -\frac{f_0(0)|\varphi_0^{(2)}(0)|}{2}Kh_l^4 + o(h_l^4).$$

Now we show (7.41). First for a fixed $\delta > 0$, we know that $\tau^0_{n,+}$ and $\tau^0_{n,-}$ will be in $[-\delta, \delta]$ eventually, with high probability. Now we consider three families of functions, analogous to $\Delta_{LK,1}$, $\Delta_{RK,1}$, and $\Delta_{NK,1}$, respectively. Define $\Delta_{LK,1,b,c}$ by replacing $\tau^0_{n,-}$ with b and $\tau^0_{n,+}$ with c in (7.32). Define $\Delta_{NK,1,b,c}$ by replacing $\tau^0_{n,-}$ with b and $\tau^0_{n,+}$ with c in (7.36). Define $\mathcal{F}_{LK,b,R} := \{\Delta_{LK,b,y} | b < a < y,\ 0 \leq y - b \leq R\}$ and $\mathcal{F}_{NK,b,R} := \{\Delta_{NK,b,y} | b < a < y,\ 0 \leq y - b \leq R\}$ for $R > -b$. Define $\mathcal{F}_{RK,b,R}$ analogously to $\mathcal{F}_{LK,b,R}$. Let $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{F}_{LK,b,R} \cup \mathcal{F}_{RK,b,R} \cup \mathcal{F}_{NK,b,R}$, and note that $\mathcal{F}$ is VC-class with VC-index of 4. Thus Theorem 2.6.7 on page 141 of van der Vaart and Wellner [1996] shows that the entropy bound condition in Lemma A.1 on page 2560 of Balabdaoui and Wellner [2007] holds for $\mathcal{F}$. Then the function $F_{b,R}(x)$, defined to be constant equal to $(7/4)R$ on $[b, b+R]$ and 0 otherwise, is an envelope for $\mathcal{F}$. That $F_{b,R}$ is an envelope is immediate for $\Delta \in \mathcal{F}_{NK,b,R}$ and for the setting where $\tau^0_{n,+} < -\tau^0_{n,-}$ and $\Delta \in \mathcal{F}_{LK,b,R}$ (and analogously when $\tau^0_{n,+} > -\tau^0_{n,-}$ and $\Delta \in \mathcal{F}_{RK,b,R}$). (For $\Delta \in \mathcal{F}_{NK,b,R}$, the longer interval has slope ± 1 and the other interval has opposite sign slope. For the case $\tau^0_{n,+} < -\tau^0_{n,-}$ and $\Delta \in \mathcal{F}_{LK,b,R}$, the interval $[\tau^0_{n,-}, \tau^0_{n,-}/2]$ has slope 1 and the slope on the rest is opposite sign (and analogously for $\mathcal{F}_{RK,b,R}$).) For the case $\tau^0_{n,+} \geq -\tau^0_{n,-}$ and $\Delta \in \mathcal{F}_{LK,b,R}$, we need only note

$$0 \leq m_2 = \frac{\tau^0_{n,+}}{-\tau^0_{n,-}} \left(\frac{-9 - 3\frac{\tau^0_{n,+}}{-\tau^0_{n,-}}}{1 - 5\frac{\tau^0_{n,+}}{-\tau^0_{n,-}}} \right) \leq 3,$$

so that $(-\tau^0_{n,-}/4)m_2 \leq (3/4)\tau^0_{n,+}$. Next, we compute the integral of the envelope squared

$$EF^2_{b,R}(X) \quad = \quad \int_b^{b+R} R^2 f_0(x) dx \leq \|f_0\|_\infty R^3,$$

where $\|f_0\|_\infty$ is the supremum over $\mathbb{R}$ of the (log-concave) density f_0, and is thus universal across b and R. Thus, we can conclude from Lemma A.1 on page 2560 of Balabdaoui and Wellner [2007] that for $\varepsilon > 0$ and with $s = 2$ and $d = 2$,

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \int \Delta_1 d(\mathbb{F}_n - F_0) \right| &\leq \varepsilon(\tau^0_{n,+} - \tau^0_{n,-})^4 + O_p(n^{-4/5}), \\ &\leq \varepsilon 2^4 h_l^4 + O_p(n^{-4/5}) \end{aligned}$$

as desired. □

Lemma 7.7. *For* $h_l = \max(\tau^0_{n,+} - m, m - \tau^0_{n,-})$, $h_s = \min(\tau^0_{n,+} - m, m - \tau^0_{n,-})$ *and* Δ_1 *defined by* (7.37), *we have*

$$\int \Delta_1(t)(t-m)^2 dt \quad \leq \quad -K h_l^4,$$

for some $K > 0$.

Proof. First, we consider $\Delta_{LK,1}$, assume without loss of generality that $m = 0$, and assume $\tau^0_{n,+} > -\tau^0_{n,-}$. Direct computation shows

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{\tau^0_{n,-}}^{\tau^0_{n,+}} t\Delta_{LK,1}(t)dt &= -\frac{5}{12}\left(\frac{(\tau^0_{n,+}-\tau^0_{n,-})(\tau^0_{n,+})^3}{5\tau^0_{n,+}+\tau^0_{n,-}}\right) \le -\frac{5}{12}\left(\frac{(\tau^0_{n,+}-\tau^0_{n,-})(\tau^0_{n,+})^3}{5(\tau^0_{n,+})}\right) \\ &\le -\frac{5}{12}\frac{(\tau^0_{n,+})^4}{5\tau^0_{n,+}} = -\frac{(\tau^0_{n,+})^3}{12} = -\frac{h_l^3}{12}\end{aligned}$$

where the second line requires $\tau^0_{n,+} > -\tau^0_{n,-}$.

We break $\int_{\tau^0_{n,-}}^{\tau^0_{n,+}} t^2\Delta_{LK,1}(t)dt$ into two pieces. First we see

$$\int_{\tau^0_{n,-}}^{0} t^2\Delta_{LK,1}(t)dt = \frac{-3(\tau^0_{n,-})^4\tau^0_{n,+} - 19(-(\tau^0_{n,-}))^3(\tau^0_{n,+})^2}{96(5\tau^0_{n,+}+\tau^0_{n,-})} < 0.$$

Next we see that

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{0}^{\tau^0_{n,+}} t^2\Delta_{LK,1}(t)dt &= \frac{-3(-\tau^0_{n,-})(\tau^0_{n,+})^4 - 5(\tau^0_{n,+})^5}{12(5\tau^0_{n,+}+\tau^0_{n,-})} \\ &\le -\frac{3(-\tau^0_{n,-})(\tau^0_{n,+})^4 + 5(\tau^0_{n,+})^5}{12\cdot 5(\tau^0_{n,+})} \le -\frac{(\tau^0_{n,+})^4}{12}.\end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$\int_{\tau^0_{n,-}}^{\tau^0_{n,+}} t^2\Delta_{LK,1}(t)dt \le -\frac{(\tau^0_{n,+})^4}{12} = -\frac{h_l^4}{12},$$

as desired.

Now we consider $\Delta_{LK,1}$ when $\tau^0_{n,+} < -\tau^0_{n,-}$, and again split the computation into two pieces. First we see

$$\int_{0}^{\tau^0_{n,+}} t^2\Delta_{LK,1}(t)dt = -\frac{2(\tau^0_{n,-})^2(\tau^0_{n,+})^3 - 3(\tau^0_{n,+})^5}{12(5\tau^0_{n,+}-2\tau^0_{n,-})}.$$

Next we find that

$$\int_{\tau^0_{n,-}}^{a} t^2\Delta_{LK,1}(t)dt = -\frac{(-\tau^0_{n,-})^5 + 5(\tau^0_{n,-})^4\tau^0_{n,+}}{48(5\tau^0_{n,+}-2\tau^0_{n,-})}$$

so that

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{\tau^0_{n,-}}^{\tau^0_{n,+}} t^2\Delta_{LK,1}(t)dt &= \frac{(\tau^0_{n,-})^5 - 5(\tau^0_{n,-})^4\tau^0_{n,+} - 8(\tau^0_{n,-})^3(\tau_{n,+})^3 + 12(\tau^0_{n,+})^5}{48(5\tau^0_{n,+}-2\tau^0_{n,-})} \\ &\le -\frac{(-\tau^0_{n,-})^4}{48\cdot 7} \qquad (7.47)\end{aligned}$$

and it remains only to prove the last inequality. To do this, let $a \equiv \tau^0_{n,-} < 0 < \tau^0_{n,+} \equiv b$ where $-a \geq b$. Then we want to show that

$$\frac{a^5 - 5a^4b - 8a^2b^3 + 12b^5}{48(5b - 2a)} + \frac{a^4}{48 \cdot 7} \leq 0.$$

Equivalently we want to show that

$$7(a^5 - 5a^4b - 8a^2b^3 + 12b^5) + a^4(5b - 2a) \leq 0,$$

or, alternatively, that

$$-K(a,b) \equiv 5a^5 - 30a^4b - 56a^2b^3 + 84b^5 \leq 0.$$

This last inequality holds if and only if

$$K(a,b) = -5a^5 + 30a^4b + 56a^2b^3 - 84b^5 \geq 0$$

for all $a < 0 < b$ with $-a \geq b$. But this holds if and only if $J(v,c) \equiv K(-v,cv) \geq 0$ holds for all $v \geq 0$ and $0 \leq c \leq 1$. But

$$\begin{aligned} J(v,c) = K(-v,cv) &= 5v^5 + 30v^5c + 56v^5c^3 - 84v^5c^5 \\ &= v^5(5 + 30c + 56c^3 - 84c^5) \\ &\geq v^5(5c^5 + 30c^5 + 56c^5 - 84c^5) = v^5c^5(5 + 30 + 56 - 84) \\ &= v^5c^5 \cdot 7 \geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

Thus (7.47) holds.

Identical calculations hold for $\Delta_{RK,1}$. Now we examine $\Delta_{NK,1}$. Direct computation shows

$$\int_{\tau^0_{n,-}}^{\tau^0_{n,+}} t^2 \Delta_{NK,1}(t)dt = -\frac{1}{12}(h_s^3 h_l + h_l^4) \leq -\frac{1}{12}h_l^4.$$

□

7.3.2. Proofs for mode-constrained limit process

This entire section is devoted to the proof of Theorem 5.6, and thus throughout this section we take the definitions and assumptions as given in that theorem.

Proof of Lemma 5.7. If $0 \in \widehat{S}^0$ then one of τ^0_+ or τ^0_- is 0, because then $(\widehat{\varphi}^0)^{(2)}$ is not constant-equal-to-0 on any open neighborhood of 0; if it is not constant-equal-to-0 on $[0,\delta)$ for any $0 < \delta$ then $(\widehat{\varphi}^0)'$ is also not constant on $[0,\delta)$, so since $0 \geq (\widehat{\varphi}^0)'(0+)$, we have $(\widehat{\varphi}^0)'(\delta+) < 0$ for all $\delta > 0$, i.e. $\tau^0_+ = 0$ (of course $\tau^0_+ \geq 0$ since 0 is the mode of $\widehat{\varphi}^0$). Similarly, if $(\widehat{\varphi}^0)^{(2)}$ is not 0 on any neighborhood below 0, then $\tau^0_- = 0$.

Now, if $0 \notin \widehat{S}^0$ then $\tau_-^0 = \sup \widehat{S}^0 \cap (-\infty, 0]$ and $\tau_+^0 = \inf \widehat{S}^0 \cap [0, \infty)$. If $0 \in \widehat{S}^0$ then we have shown that one of $\tau_\pm^0$ equals 0. Thus, in either case, it is clear that $(\widehat{\varphi}^0)^{(2)}(t\pm) = 0$ for $0 \le t < \tau_+^0$ and for $\tau_-^0 < t \le 0$. Thus, regardless of whether $0 \in \widehat{S}^0$, $(\widehat{\varphi}^0)^{(2)}$ and so $(\widehat{\varphi}^0)'$ are constant and equal to 0 on (τ_-^0, τ_+^0), i.e. (5.19) holds (and so (τ_-^0, τ_+^0) is the modal interval of $\widehat{\varphi}^0$). □

The next lemma gives the sense in which $\widehat{\varphi}^0$ is piecewise affine.

Lemma 7.8. *Assume that H_L, H_R, and $\widehat{\varphi}^0$ are as in Theorem 5.6. Define*

$$\begin{aligned} S_L &= \{t \le 0 : H_L(t) = Y_L(t), H_L'(t) = Y_L'(t)\}, \\ S_R &= \{t \ge 0 : H_R(t) = Y_R(t), H_R'(t) = Y_R'(t)\}, \\ \text{and } S^0 &= S_L \cup S_R \cup \{0\}. \end{aligned} \tag{7.48}$$

Then $\widehat{\varphi}^0$ is a monotonically nonincreasing function and its 'bend points', $\widehat{S}^0$, defined in (5.10), satisfy $\widehat{S}^0 \subset S^0$. Additionally, with probability 1 the following statements hold. The sets S_L, S_R, and S^0 are all closed and have Lebesgue measure 0. For any fixed $t \ne 0$, $t \notin S^0$ and so $(H^0)^{(3)}(t)$ is well-defined.

The lemma says that for any knot $\tau \le \tau_+^0$, if $\tau < 0$ then $\tau \in S_L$. Similarly if $\tau \ge \tau_-^0$ and $\tau > 0$ then $\tau \in S_R$. It is possible but not guaranteed that 0 is a knot and lies in either S_L or S_R.

Proof. By Theorem 5.6, displays (5.16) and (5.17), $H^0 - Y^0 \le 0$, which allows us to conclude

$$\begin{aligned} \{t < 0 : H_L(t) = Y_L(t)\} &= \{t < 0 : H_L(t) = Y_L(t), H_L'(t) = Y_L'(t)\}, \\ \{t > 0 : H_R(t) = Y_R(t)\} &= \{t > 0 : H_R(t) = Y_R(t), H_R'(t) = Y_R'(t)\}; \end{aligned} \tag{7.49}$$

the first line follows since $H_L - Y_L$ is differentiable on $(-\infty, 0)$, and a differentiable function has derivative 0 at a local maximum (see, e.g., Dieudonné [1969], page 153, Problem 3, part (a)). The same argument applies to the second line of (7.49).

Now, the following argument holds with probability 1 and for any fixed $c > 0$. On $[0, c]$, H_R has a bounded second derivative, so that there exists a constant $a > 0$ such that $\tilde{H}_R(t) := H_R(t) + at^2$ is convex on $[0, c]$. Let $\tilde{Y}_R(t) := Y_R(t) + at^2$. Now, $Y_R + A = Y$ for an affine function A and where $Y(t) = \int_0^t \int_0^u dX(z)du$. Let $\tilde{Y}(t) = Y(t) + at^2 = \tilde{Y}_R(t) + A(t)$ so that

$$\begin{aligned} \{x \in [0, c] : H_R(x) = Y_R(x)\} &= \{x \in [0, c] : \tilde{H}_R(x) + A(x) = \tilde{Y}_R(x) + A(x)\} \\ &= \{x \in [0, c] : \tilde{H}_R(x) + A(x) = \tilde{Y}(x)\} \end{aligned} \tag{7.50}$$

We also have $\tilde{H}_R + A \le \tilde{Y}_R + A = \tilde{Y}$ by (5.17), so that, letting $M_{\tilde{Y}}$ be the greatest convex minorant of $\tilde{Y}$ on $[0, c]$, we have $\tilde{H}_R + A \le M_{\tilde{Y}} \le \tilde{Y}$, since $\tilde{H}_R + A$ is convex and below $\tilde{Y}$.

Now by the proof of Corollary 2.1 of Groeneboom, Jongbloed and Wellner [2001a], which is by Definition 1 and Theorem 1 of Sinai [1992], the points of touch of $M_{\tilde{Y}}$ with $\tilde{Y}$ (on $[0,c]$) is a Cantor-type set which has Lebesgue measure 0, so that (7.50) is contained in this Cantor-type set, and thus (by (7.49) and) by letting $c \to \infty$, we see that S_R is contained in a set which has Lebesgue measure 0. Finally, S_R is closed because $H_R - Y_R$ and $(H_R - Y_R)'$ are both continuous functions. By an analogous argument, we can conclude that S_L is closed and has Lebesgue measure 0 and thus also S^0 is closed and has Lebesgue measure 0. By (5.18),

$$\int_{\{t\in(-\infty,\tau_-^0]:H_L(t)\neq Y_L(t)\}} d(\widehat{\varphi}^0)'(t) = 0 = \int_{\{t\in[\tau_+^0,\infty):H_R(t)\neq Y_R(t)\}} d(\widehat{\varphi}^0)'(t), \tag{7.51}$$

(regardless of whether one of τ_+^0 or τ_-^0 is 0 or not).

Thus we now conclude that $\widehat{S}^0 \subset S^0$ as follows. If τ is an element of the set $\widehat{S}^0$ then for any $\varepsilon > 0$ $(\widehat{\varphi}^0)'(\tau-\varepsilon,\tau+\varepsilon) < 0$ (here $(\widehat{\varphi}^0)'$ refers to the signed measure corresponding to $(\widehat{\varphi}^0)'$). This is by the definition of derivative; since $(\widehat{\varphi}^0)'$ is nonincreasing, $\delta \mapsto (\widehat{\varphi}^0)'(\tau+\delta) - (\widehat{\varphi}^0)'(\tau-\delta) \leq 0$ is nonincreasing. Thus if

$$\frac{(\widehat{\varphi}^0)'(\tau+\delta) - (\widehat{\varphi}^0)'(\tau-\delta)}{2\delta} \tag{7.52}$$

does not converge to 0 as $\delta \searrow 0$, then for all $\varepsilon > 0$ there is $0 < \delta < \varepsilon$ such that (7.52) is $<$ const., i.e.,

$$(\widehat{\varphi}^0)'(\tau+\varepsilon) - (\widehat{\varphi}^0)'(\tau-\varepsilon) \leq (\widehat{\varphi}^0)'(\tau+\delta) - (\widehat{\varphi}^0)'(\tau-\delta) < 0. \tag{7.53}$$

Since $H_R - Y_R$ is continuous on all of $\mathbb{R}$, if $H_R(\tau) - Y_R(\tau) < 0$ for $\tau \geq \tau_+^0$, then on a neighborhood $(\tau-\varepsilon,\tau+\varepsilon)$ for some $\varepsilon > 0$ we have $H_R - Y_R < 0$ and so the integral on the right-hand side of (7.51) is strictly less than 0. Thus if $\tau \geq \tau_+^0$, then $(H_R - Y_R)(\tau) = 0$. For $\tau > 0$, this implies that $\tau \in S_R$ by (7.49). Similarly, if $\tau \leq \tau_-^0$ and $\tau < 0$, then $(H_L - Y_L)(\tau) = 0$ and $\tau \in S_L$. We have $(\tau_-^0,\tau_+^0) \cap \widehat{S}^0 = \emptyset$ by Lemma 5.7, so we have shown that if $\tau \in \widehat{S}^0$, then τ is either 0 (if one of τ_-^0 or τ_+^0 is 0) or is in S_L or S_R, i.e. $\tau \in S^0$.

Now, by the proof of Theorem 1 of Sinai [1992], any fixed point $t \geq 0$ belongs to the Cantor-type set described above, in which S_R is contained, with probability zero. An analogous statement holds for $t \leq 0$ and S_L. Thus, if $t \neq 0$, $t \notin S^0$ and so $(H_L)^{(2)}$ is concave and affine in a neighborhood of t, so $(H_L)^{(3)}(t)$ is well-defined. □

By Lemma 7.8,

$$H_L(\tau_L) = Y_L(\tau_L) = 0, \text{ and } H_L'(\tau_L) = Y_L'(\tau_L) = 0. \tag{7.54}$$

This is because, by its definition, either $\tau_L < 0$, in which case $\tau_L \in S_L$, or there is a sequence $\{\tau_{L,n}^0\} \subset S_L$ with $\tau_{L,n}^0 < 0$ for all n. In this latter case, since $H_L - Y_L$ and $H_L' - Y_L'$ are both continuous, we still conclude that $H_L(\tau_L) =$

$Y_L(\tau_L) = 0$, and $H_L'(\tau_L) = Y_L'(\tau_L) = 0$. Analogously, $H_R(\tau_R) = Y_R(\tau_R)$ and $H_R'(\tau_R) = Y_R'(\tau_R)$. This suggests the following definitions:

$$F_L(u) = \int_u^{\tau_L} \widehat{\varphi}^0(v)dv \quad \text{and} \quad F_R(u) = \int_{\tau_R}^u \widehat{\varphi}^0(v)dv, \tag{7.55}$$

$$X_L(u) = \int_u^{\tau_L} dX(v) \quad \text{and} \quad X_R(u) = \int_{\tau_R}^u dX(v). \tag{7.56}$$

It is then true by definition that

$$Y_L(t) = \int_t^{\tau_L} X_L(u)du, \quad \text{and} \quad Y_R(t) = \int_{\tau_R}^t X_R(u)du. \tag{7.57}$$

It is furthermore true that

$$H_L(t) = \int_t^{\tau_L}\int_u^{\tau_L} \widehat{\varphi}^0(v)dvdu = \int_t^{\tau_L} F_L(u)du, \tag{7.58}$$

$$H_R(t) = \int_{\tau_R}^t\int_{\tau_R}^u \widehat{\varphi}^0(v)dvdu = \int_{\tau_R}^t F_R(u)du, \tag{7.59}$$

since $H_L(t) = \int_t^{\tau_L}\int_u^{\tau_L} \widehat{\varphi}^0(v)dvdu + A_L(t)$ where $A_L(t)$ is an affine function, and we just verified in (7.54) that $A_L(t) \equiv 0$. An analogous statement holds for H_R.

Remark 7.9. Note that since S^0 is closed, τ_+, τ_- are both elements of S^0. Also, it is possible for $H_L^{(3)}$ to have a point of increase at 0 without $H_L'(0) = Y_L'(0)$, since the inequality (5.16) only holds on $(-\infty, 0]$, so not in an open neighborhood of 0. Similarly for $H_R^{(3)}$. This is why we add the point 0 to S^0.

Lemma 7.8 suggests that we can think of $\widehat{\varphi}^0$ as being piecewise affine (with a potentially uncountable number of knot points), because with probability 1, the union of the open intervals on which $\widehat{\varphi}^0$ is affine has full Lebesgue measure on the real line (meaning its complement has Lebesgue measure 0). For $t \in \mathbb{R}$, we let $\tau_+^0(t)$ be the first knot larger than t, and analogously for $\tau_-^0(t)$,

$$\tau_+^0(t) = \inf\left(\widehat{S}^0 \cap [t, \infty)\right) \quad \text{and} \quad \tau_-^0(t) = \sup\left(\widehat{S}^0 \cap (-\infty, t]\right). \tag{7.60}$$

Lemma 7.10. *We again assume the full setup of Theorem 5.6. Then, for any (fixed or random) $T \geq 0$, with probability 1 there are 'knot points' $\tau_+^0(T)$ and $\tau_-^0(T)$ in $\widehat{S}^0$.*

Proof. We fix $T \geq 0$, and we will show that there exists $\tau_+(T) \in \widehat{S}^0$ with $\tau_+(T) > T \geq 0$. We assume for contradiction that $\widehat{\varphi}^0$ has no knots on (T, ∞), and thus is linear. Thus H_R is cubic on $[T, \infty)$, so can be written as $H_R(t) = \sum_{i=0}^3 A_i(t-T)^i$ for some random A_i. By definition, we have

$$\begin{aligned} Y_R(t) = \int_{\tau_R}^t X_R(u)du &= \int_{\tau_R}^t (X(u) - X(\tau_R))du \\ &= \int_0^t X(u)du - \int_0^{\tau_R} X(u)du - (t - \tau_R)X(\tau_R). \end{aligned}$$

In other words, $Y_R(t)$ is $\int_0^t X(u)du = V(t) + t^4$ plus a random affine function, where $V(t) = \int_0^t W(u)du$. Thus we can write

$$Y_R(t) - H_R(t) = V(t) + t^4 - \sum_{i=0}^{3} B_i(t-T)^i,$$

for some new random coefficients, B_i (where only for $i = 0, 1$ are B_i not equal to A_i). Now, let $\varphi(t) = \sqrt{\frac{2}{3}t^3 \log\log t}$. Then by page 1714 of Lachal [1997] (or from page 238 of Watanabe [1970]), we know that almost surely

$$\limsup_{t\to\infty} \frac{\int_0^t W(u)du}{\varphi(t)} = 1.$$

Thus,

$$\frac{Y_R(t) - H_R(t)}{\varphi(t)} = \frac{V(t)}{\varphi(t)} + \frac{t^4 - \sum_{i=0}^{3} B_i(t-T)^i}{\varphi(t)},$$

which gets larger than 0 for t large enough, as it is almost surely bounded below by a quadratic polynomial (with positive first coefficient) minus 1. This contradicts the fact that $Y_R(t) - H_R(t) \leq 0$ for all t, so we are done. Our argument applies with probability 1 to any $T \geq 0$, and thus to the entire sample space of any random $T \geq 0$. An identical argument works for showing there exists a knot less than $-T$. □

We will not speak of $\widehat{\varphi}^0$ as a minimizer of an objective function, but we will instead show that for acceptable Δ perturbations that $\int \Delta(t)(\widehat{\varphi}^0(t)dt - dX(t)) \geq 0$, i.e. $\widehat{\varphi}^0$ behaves as we would expect a minimizer to behave.

Proposition 7.11. *We assume the full setup of Theorem 5.6. Let $\Delta : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ be concave with maximum at 0. If $a, b \in \widehat{S}^0$ with $-\infty < a < 0 < b < \infty$ then*

$$\int_a^b \Delta(t)(\widehat{\varphi}^0(t)dt - dX(t)) \geq 0, \tag{7.61}$$

and thus, by Lemma 7.10, $\limsup_{a\to\infty} \int_{-a}^{a} \Delta(t)(\widehat{\varphi}^0(t)dt - dX(t)) \geq 0$.

Proof. We use the notation $g(a, b] = g(b) - g(a)$ here. We have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_a^b \Delta(t)(\widehat{\varphi}^0(t)dt - dX(t)) \\
&\quad = -\int_a^0 \Delta(t)(dF_L(t) - dX_L(t)) + \int_0^b \Delta(t)(dF_R(t) - dX_R(t)) \\
&\quad = -\left[(\Delta(F_L - X_L))(a, 0] - \int_a^0 ((F_L - X_L)\Delta')(t)dt\right] \\
&\qquad + (\Delta(F_R - X_R))(0, b] - \int_0^b ((F_R - X_R)\Delta')(t)dt.
\end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 7.8, $a \in S_L$, $b \in S_R$, and since neither a nor b is 0, we have $(F_R - X_R)(b) = 0 = (F_L - X_L)(a)$ and we recall (5.18). Also recalling that $(H_L - Y_L)' = -(F_L - X_L)$, we see that the above display equals

$$\begin{aligned}
&-\Delta(0)((F_L - X_L)(0) + (F_R - X_R)(0)) \\
&- \left[((H_R - Y_R)\Delta'(\cdot+))(0, b] - \int_0^b (H_R - Y_R)(t) d\Delta'(t)\right] \\
&- \left[((H_L - Y_L)\Delta'(\cdot-))(a, 0] - \int_a^0 (H_L - Y_L)(t) d\Delta'(t)\right] \\
&\quad = -\Delta(0)\left(\int_0^{\tau_L} (\widehat{\varphi}^0(t)dt - dX(t)) + \int_{\tau_R}^0 (\widehat{\varphi}^0(t)dt - dX(t))\right) \\
&\qquad + (H_R - Y_R)(0)\Delta'(0+) - (H_L - Y_L)(0)\Delta'(0-) \\
&\qquad + \int_0^b (H_R - Y_R)(t) d\Delta'(t) + \int_a^0 (H_L - Y_L)(t) d\Delta'(t) \\
&\geq 0,
\end{aligned}$$

where the inequality follows because each of the three lines in the final expression is ≤ 0, as follows. The first line is equal to 0 by (5.15); the third line is ≥ 0 by (5.16) and (5.17), and the fact that Δ is concave so Δ' is monotonically nonincreasing so $d\Delta'$ is a nonpositive measure; similarly, the second line is ≥ 0 because Δ has maximum at 0, so that $(H_R - Y_R)(0)$, $\Delta'(0+)$, $(H_L - Y_L)(0)$, and $-\Delta'(0-)$ are nonpositive. □

The above proof can be extended to Δ such that $\widehat{\varphi}^0(t) + \varepsilon\Delta(t) \in \mathcal{G}^0$, where $\mathcal{G}^0$ is the set of concave functions with maximum at 0, but we will not need this per se. Rather, in the next result we will express the same idea by showing for knots $a < 0 < b$ that $\int_a^b \widehat{\varphi}^0(t)\left(\widehat{\varphi}^0(t)dt - dX(t)\right) = 0$, and re-express this via integration by parts formulae.

Proposition 7.12. *We again assume the full setup of Theorem 5.6 and assume that $a, b \in \widehat{S}^0$, and $a < 0 < b$. Then*

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_a^b \widehat{\varphi}^0(t)(\widehat{\varphi}^0(t)dt - dX(t)) \\
&\qquad = \int_a^0 ((F_L - X_L)(\widehat{\varphi}^0)')(t)dt - \int_0^b ((F_R - X_R)(\widehat{\varphi}^0)')(t)dt \\
&\qquad = \int_a^{\tau_L} (H_L - Y_L)(t) d(\widehat{\varphi}^0)'(t) + \int_{\tau_R}^b (H_R - Y_R)(t) d(\widehat{\varphi}^0)'(t) \\
&\qquad = 0.
\end{aligned}$$

Proof. Since $a < 0 < b$, we again have $F_L(a) - X_L(a) = 0 = F_R(b) - X_R(b)$ by

Lemma 7.8, so

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_a^b \widehat{\varphi}^0(t)(\widehat{\varphi}^0(t)dt - dX(t)) \\
&\quad = -\int_a^0 \widehat{\varphi}^0(t)d(F_L(t) - X_L(t)) + \int_0^b \widehat{\varphi}^0(t)d(F_R(t) - X_R(t)) \\
&\quad = -\left[(\widehat{\varphi}^0(F_L - X_L))(a,0] - \int_a^0 ((F_L - X_L)(\widehat{\varphi}^0)')(t)dt\right] \\
&\qquad + (\widehat{\varphi}^0(F_R - X_R))(0,b] - \int_0^b ((F_R - X_R)(\widehat{\varphi}^0)')(t)dt
\end{aligned}$$

which equals

$$\begin{aligned}
&-\left[(\widehat{\varphi}^0(F_L - X_L))(0) - \int_a^0 ((F_L - X_L)(\widehat{\varphi}^0)')(t)dt\right] \\
&\quad - (\widehat{\varphi}^0(F_R - X_R))(0) - \int_0^b ((F_R - X_R)(\widehat{\varphi}^0)')(t)dt \\
&\quad = \int_a^0 ((F_L - X_L)(\widehat{\varphi}^0)')(t)dt - \int_0^b ((F_R - X_R)(\widehat{\varphi}^0)')(t)dt,
\end{aligned}$$

where the last equality is by (5.15). Using that $\widehat{\varphi}^0$ is constant on (τ_-^0, τ_+^0), and using the notation $g[c,d] = g(d) - g(c-)$, we can write the last expression above as

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_a^{\tau_-^0} ((F_L - X_L)(\widehat{\varphi}^0)')(t)dt - \int_{\tau_+^0}^b ((F_R - X_R)(\widehat{\varphi}^0)')(t)dt \\
&\quad = ((\widehat{\varphi}^0)'(H_L - Y_L))[a, \tau_-^0] - \int_{[a,\tau_-^0]} (H_L - Y_L)(t)d(\widehat{\varphi}^0)'(t) \\
&\qquad - \left[((\widehat{\varphi}^0)'(H_R - Y_R))[\tau_+^0, b] - \int_{[\tau_+^0,b]} (H_R - Y_R)(t)d(\widehat{\varphi}^0)'(t)\right] \\
&\quad = -\int_{[a,\tau_-^0]} (H_L - Y_L)(t)d(\widehat{\varphi}^0)'(t) + \int_{[\tau_+^0,b]} (H_R - Y_R)(t)d(\widehat{\varphi}^0)'(t) \\
&\quad = 0,
\end{aligned}$$

using the general integration by parts formula for the first equality since $H_L - Y_L$ and $H_R - Y_R$ are continuous (see Lemma 8.1), and using (5.18) for the third equality. The second equality follows from Lemma 7.8, since a knot a and limit of knots τ_- are elements of S_L, and similarly b, τ_+ are elements of S_R. □

Next we prove a representation lemma, analogous to the midpoint result for the unconstrained (and compact support) case in Lemma 2.3 on page 1631 of Groeneboom, Jongbloed and Wellner [2001a].

Lemma 7.13. *We again assume the full setup of Theorem 5.6. Let $\tau_1, \tau_2 \in \widehat{S}^0$ be such that $\widehat{\varphi}^0$ is affine on $[\tau_1, \tau_2]$, and let $t \in [\tau_1, \tau_2]$. For any function g, we define $\Delta g = g(\tau_2) - g(\tau_1)$ and $\bar{g} = \frac{g(\tau_1)+g(\tau_2)}{2}$, including in particular, $\Delta\tau = \tau_2 - \tau_1$ and $\bar{\tau} = (\tau_1 + \tau_2)/2$. Then if $0 < \tau_1 < \tau_2$, we can conclude*

$$H_R(t) = \frac{(Y_R(\tau_2)(t-\tau_1) + Y_R(\tau_1)(\tau_2 - t))}{\Delta\tau} - \frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{\Delta X_R}{\Delta\tau} + \frac{4}{(\Delta\tau)^3}(\bar{X}_R\Delta\tau - \Delta Y_R)(t-\bar{\tau})\right)(t-\tau_1)(\tau_2 - t), \tag{7.62}$$

and thus

$$H_R(\bar{\tau}) = \bar{Y}_R - \frac{1}{8}\Delta X_R \Delta\tau. \tag{7.63}$$

If $\tau_1 < \tau_2 < 0$, we can conclude

$$H_L(t) = \frac{Y_L(\tau_2)(t-\tau_1) + Y_L(\tau_1)(\tau_2 - t)}{\Delta\tau} - \frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{-\bar{X}_L}{\Delta\tau} + \frac{4}{(\Delta\tau)^3}(-\bar{X}_L\Delta\tau - \Delta Y_L)(t-\bar{\tau})\right)(t-\tau_1)(\tau_2 - t), \tag{7.64}$$

and thus

$$H_L(\bar{\tau}) = \bar{Y}_L + \frac{1}{8}\Delta X_L \Delta\tau. \tag{7.65}$$

Proof. We assume that on $[\tau_1, \tau_2]$, that $\widehat{\varphi}^0$ is linear and thus H_L and H_R are cubic polynomials. Thus, taking $\tau_1 < \tau_2 < 0$, H_L is defined by its values and its derivative's values at τ_i, for $i = 1, 2$. Thus, if we name the polynomial on the right hand side of (7.64) P_L, it suffices to check that $P_L(\tau_i)$ and $P_L'(\tau_i)$ equal $H_L(\tau_i)$ and $H_L'(\tau_i)$, respectively, for $i = 1, 2$, to conclude that $H_L(t) = P_L(t)$ for $t \in [\tau_1, \tau_2]$. We know that $H_L(\tau_i) = Y_L(\tau_i)$ by (5.18) and it is immediate that $P_L(\tau_i) = Y_L(\tau_i)$, so we only need to check the derivative values. To differentiate, we denote

$$A(t) = \frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{-\bar{X}_L}{\Delta\tau} + \frac{4}{(\Delta\tau)^3}(-\bar{X}_L\Delta\tau - \Delta Y_L)(t-\bar{\tau})\right),$$

so that

$$P_L(t) = \frac{Y_L(\tau_2)(t-\tau_1) + Y_L(\tau_1)(\tau_2 - t)}{\Delta\tau} - A(t)(t-\tau_1)(\tau_2 - t),$$

and

$$P_L'(t) = \frac{Y_L(\tau_2) - Y_L(\tau_1)}{\Delta\tau} - A'(t)(t-\tau_1)(\tau_2 - t) - A(t)((\tau_2 - t) - (t-\tau_1)),$$

so that

$$\begin{aligned}
P_L'(\tau_1) &= \frac{\Delta Y_L}{\Delta\tau} - A(\tau_1)\Delta\tau \\
&= \frac{\Delta Y_L}{\Delta\tau} - \frac{1}{2}\left\{\frac{-\Delta X_L}{\Delta\tau} + \frac{4}{(\Delta\tau)^3}(-\bar{X}_L\Delta\tau - \Delta Y_L)\left(\frac{-\Delta\tau}{2}\right)\right\}\Delta\tau \\
&= \frac{\Delta Y_L}{\Delta\tau} + \frac{\Delta X_L}{2} + \frac{1}{\Delta\tau}\left(-\bar{X}_L\Delta\tau - \Delta Y_L\right) \\
&= \frac{\Delta Y_L}{\Delta\tau} + \frac{\Delta X_L}{2} - \bar{X}_L - \frac{\Delta Y_L}{\Delta\tau} \\
&= -X_L(\tau_1).
\end{aligned}$$

This equals $H_L'(\tau_1)$, as desired, since $H_L'(\tau_1) = Y_L'(\tau_1)$ by Lemma 7.8 since τ_1 is strictly less than 0, and $Y_L'(\tau_1) = -X_L(\tau_1)$. Similarly, $P_L'(\tau_2) = -X_L(\tau_2)$ and, letting P_R be the polynomial on the right hand side of (7.64), $P_R'(\tau_i) = X_R(\tau_i)$ and $P_R(\tau_i) = Y_R(\tau_i)$. Then (7.63) and (7.65) follow immediately. □

Next, we show a tightness-type of results for the bend points. Recall the definition (7.60) of $\tau_-^0(t)$ and $\tau_+^0(t)$.

Lemma 7.14. *Let the assumptions of Theorem 5.6 hold. Then, for all $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists M_ε such that for all $t > 0$,*

$$P(\tau_+^0(t) > t + M_\varepsilon) < \varepsilon, \tag{7.66}$$

$$P(\tau_-^0(-t) < -t - M_\varepsilon) < \varepsilon, \tag{7.67}$$

$$P((t - M_\varepsilon) \vee 0 \le \tau_-^0(t) \vee 0) > 1 - \varepsilon, \tag{7.68}$$

$$P(\tau_+^0(-t) \wedge 0 \le (-t + M_\varepsilon) \wedge 0) > 1 - \varepsilon, \tag{7.69}$$

where M_ε does not depend on t.

Proof. We will show for all $t, \varepsilon > 0$ there exists $M = M_\varepsilon$ such that $P(\tau_+^0(t) > t + M) < \varepsilon$. The statement for $\tau_-^0(-t)$ is analogous. By Lemma 7.10, for any t we can find $\tau_2 \in \widehat{S}^0$ where $\tau_2 < \infty$ is taken to be $\tau_+^0(t)$; similarly, we can take $t \equiv t_\varepsilon$ large enough such that with probability $1 - \varepsilon$ there exists a knot $0 < \tau_1 < t$. To match notation up with Lemma 7.13, we will define Δg and $\bar{g}$, for any function g, as in the lemma. Since $\widehat{\varphi}^0$ is affine on $[\tau_1, \tau_2]$, Lemma 7.13 allows us to conclude that $Y_R(\bar{\tau}) \le H_R(\bar{\tau}) = \bar{Y}_R - \Delta X_R \Delta\tau/8$ which is if and only if

$$Y(\bar{\tau}) \le \bar{Y} - \frac{1}{8}\Delta X \Delta\tau, \tag{7.70}$$

where $Y(t) = \int_0^t X(u)du = V(t) + t^4$ and $V(t) = \int_0^t W(u)du$. The "if and only if" follows because $Y_R(t) = Y(t) + A(t)$ where $A(t)$ is a random affine function. Since for any affine function $A(\bar{\tau}) =: \bar{A}$, we see that

$$Y_R(\bar{\tau}) - \bar{Y}_R = Y(\bar{\tau}) + A(\bar{\tau}) - (\bar{Y} + \bar{A}) = Y(\bar{\tau}) - \bar{Y}.$$

Since ΔX trivially equals ΔX_R, we have shown (7.70). Let $M_\varepsilon > 0$ and let B_t be the event $\{0 < \tau_1 < t, \tau_2 > t + M_\varepsilon\}$. We then see

$$\begin{aligned} P(\tau_2 > t_\varepsilon + M_\varepsilon) &\le P(\tau_1 \le 0) + P(B_{t_\varepsilon}) \\ &\le \varepsilon + P\left(Y_R(\bar\tau) \le H_R(\bar\tau) = \bar Y_R - \frac{1}{8}\Delta X_R \Delta\tau, B_{t_\varepsilon}\right) \\ &\le 2\varepsilon, \end{aligned} \tag{7.71}$$

where we now show that the last inequality follows from page 1633 in the proof of Lemma 2.4 in Groeneboom, Jongbloed and Wellner [2001a]. We have already noted that $Y_R(\bar\tau) \le \bar Y_R - \frac{1}{8}\Delta X_R \Delta\tau$ if and only if $Y(\bar\tau) \le \bar Y - \frac{1}{8}\Delta X \Delta\tau$. Then Groeneboom, Jongbloed and Wellner [2001a] show algebraically that this inequality can be rewritten as

$$V(\bar\tau) - \bar V + \frac{1}{8}\Delta W \Delta\tau \le -\left(\frac{\Delta\tau}{2}\right)^4.$$

Thus we have shown for any $t > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} &P\left(Y_R(\bar\tau) \le H_R(\bar\tau) = \bar Y_R - \frac{1}{8}\Delta X_R \Delta\tau, B_t\right) \\ &\quad = P\left(V(\bar\tau) - \bar V + \frac{1}{8}\Delta W \Delta\tau \le -\left(\frac{\Delta\tau}{2}\right)^4, B_t\right). \end{aligned}$$

Groeneboom, Jongbloed and Wellner [2001a] show that

$$P\left(V(\bar\tau) - \bar V + \frac{1}{8}\Delta W \Delta\tau \le -\left(\frac{\Delta\tau}{2}\right)^4, \tau_1 < M_\varepsilon, \tau_2 > M_\varepsilon\right) < \varepsilon, \tag{7.72}$$

and thus that

$$P\left(V(\bar\tau) - \bar V + \frac{1}{8}\Delta W \Delta\tau \le -\left(\frac{\Delta\tau}{2}\right)^4, \tau_1 < t - M_\varepsilon, \tau_2 > t + M_\varepsilon\right) < \varepsilon. \tag{7.73}$$

This independence from t follows because

$$\{(W(s) - W(t), V(s) - V(t) - (s-t)W(t))\}_{s\in\mathbb{R}}$$

is equal in distribution to $\left\{W(u-t), \int_t^u W(u-t)\,du)\right\}_{u\in\mathbb{R}}$, since $\int_t^s W(u)du = \int_t^s (W(u) - W(t))du + (s-t)W(t)$, and thus $V(\bar s) - \bar V + \frac{1}{8}\Delta W \Delta s$ equals

$$\begin{aligned} &V(\bar s) - V(t) - W(t)(\bar s - t) \\ &\quad - \left(\frac{1}{2}(V(s_1) - V(t) - W(t)(s_1 - t)) + \frac{1}{2}(V(s_2) - V(t) - W(t)(s_2 - t))\right) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{8}(W(s_2) - W(t) - (W(s_1) - W(t)))(s_2 - t - (s_1 - t)) \\ &\quad =_d V\left(\frac{r_1 + r_2}{2}\right) - \frac{V(r_1) + V(r_2)}{2} + \frac{1}{8}(W(r_2) - W(r_1))(r_2 - r_1) \end{aligned}$$

where $\bar{s} = (s_1 + s_2)/2$, $\bar{V} = (V(s_1) + V(s_2))/2$, $\Delta W = W(s_2) - W(s_1)$, and $\Delta s = s_2 - s_2$ and $r_i = s_i - t$ for $i = 1, 2$. This shows that the left hand sides of both of (7.72) and (7.73) are, regardless of t, bounded by

$$P\left(V(\bar{s}) - \bar{V} + \frac{1}{8}\Delta W \Delta s \leq -\left(\frac{\Delta s}{2}\right)^4, \text{ for some } s_1 < -M_\varepsilon, s_2 > M_\varepsilon\right). \tag{7.74}$$

This probability is defined in (2.27) on page 1633 of Groeneboom, Jongbloed and Wellner [2001a], and is shown to be less than ε at the top of page 1634, so, using this fact, we have now shown (7.72) and (7.73).

The probability we consider in (7.71) is on the event $B_{t_\varepsilon} = \{0 < \tau_1 < t_\varepsilon, \tau_2 > t_\varepsilon + M_\varepsilon\}$ rather than $C_{t_\varepsilon} \equiv \{0 < \tau_1 < t_\varepsilon - M_\varepsilon, \tau_2 > t_\varepsilon + M_\varepsilon\}$. The only cost for this is we need to double our M_ε for this to correspond with the probability in (7.73). Thus (7.71) holds, but we do not yet have independence from t because of the t_ε in the expression. We easily circumvent this by replacing M_ε by $t_\varepsilon + M_\varepsilon$. Now we have shown (7.66) holds with M_ε independent of t.

Now we show (7.67). Note that we can write an analogous version of (7.71) for $t > M_\varepsilon$ as

$$\begin{aligned} P(0 \leq \tau_1 \leq t - M_\varepsilon) &\leq P(\tau_2 > t + M_\varepsilon) + P(C_t) \\ &\leq \varepsilon + P\left(Y_R(\bar{\tau}) \leq H_R(\bar{\tau}) = \bar{Y}_R - \frac{1}{8}\Delta X_R \Delta\tau, C_{t_\varepsilon}\right) \\ &\leq 2\varepsilon \end{aligned} \tag{7.75}$$

because, by the argument we just went through, the probability in the third line is again bounded by (7.74). Note we have t in place of t_ε in (7.75), so the above statement is already independent of t as long as $t > M_\varepsilon$. Thus we have shown $P((t - M) \vee 0 \leq \tau_-^0(t) \vee 0 \leq t) > 1 - \varepsilon$, since if $t < M_\varepsilon$ this probability is trivially 1. Showing the analogous statements for the left side, the existence of M, not depending on t, such that $P(\tau_-^0(-t) < -t - M) < \varepsilon$ and $P(-t \leq \tau_+^0(-t) \wedge 0 \leq (-t + M) \wedge 0) > 1 - \varepsilon$, can be done analogously. □

The next result will relate the unconstrained and constrained limit estimators in the Gaussian setting.

Corollary 7.15. *Let the definitions and assumptions of Theorem 5.6 hold, and let Y and H be as in Theorem 5.5. Let $\widehat{\varphi} \equiv H''$. For any $t \in \mathbb{R}$, define*

$$s^+(t) = \inf\{s \in [t, \infty) : \widehat{\varphi}^0(s) = \widehat{\varphi}(s)\} \tag{7.76}$$

$$s^-(t) = \sup\{s \in (-\infty, t] : \widehat{\varphi}^0(s) = \widehat{\varphi}(s)\}. \tag{7.77}$$

Then we can say that for all $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists M_ε, not depending on t, such that

$$P(t - s^-(t) > M_\varepsilon) < \varepsilon \tag{7.78}$$

$$P(s^+(t) - t > M_\varepsilon) < \varepsilon. \tag{7.79}$$

Proof. Define a right-side sequence of knots to be a sequence of points

$$0 < \nu_1 < \nu_1^0 < \nu_2 < \nu_2^0 < \nu_3,$$

where ν_i are knots for $\widehat{\varphi}$ and ν_i^0 are knots for $\widehat{\varphi}^0$. Similarly, define a left-side sequence of knots

$$\nu_{-3} < \nu_{-2}^0 < \nu_{-2} < \nu_{-1}^0 < \nu_{-1} < 0.$$

Then we argue by the Intermediate Value Theorem and the Mean Value Theorem. First, we assume we are given such a sequence, without loss of generality take it to be a right-side sequence (on the probability 1 event on which Theorem 5.5 holds). Then we can say, by our hypotheses, that

$$(H_R - Y_R)(\nu_i^0) = 0 \le (H - Y)(\nu_i^0) \quad \text{for } i = 1, 2 \tag{7.80}$$

$$(H_R - Y_R)(\nu_i) \ge 0 = (H - Y)(\nu_i) \quad \text{for } i = 1, 2, 3. \tag{7.81}$$

By the Intermediate Value Theorem we can pick points $x_1 \in [\nu_1, \nu_1^0], x_2 \in [\nu_1^0, \nu_2], x_3 \in [\nu_2, \nu_2^0]$ such that $(H_R - Y_R)(x_i) = (H - Y)(x_i)$ for $i = 1, 2, 3$. Since $Y_R(t) - Y(t) = A(t)$ is a (random) affine function, we can conclude for $i = 1, 2, 3$ that

$$H_R(x_i) - H(x_i) - A(x_i) = 0.$$

We apply the Mean Value Theorem and get $t_i \in (x_i, x_{i+1})$ for $i = 1, 2$ such that

$$F_R(t_i) - H'(t_i) - A'(t_i) = 0.$$

Again applying the Mean Value Theorem, we get $s \in (t_1, t_2) \subset (x_1, x_3) \subset [\nu_1, \nu_2^0] \subset [\nu_1, \nu_3]$.

Now we will construct right-side sequences or left-side sequences of knots and be done. Note that by Lemma 7.14 and the analogous lemma for the unconstrained case, Lemma 2.7, page 1638, of Groeneboom, Jongbloed and Wellner [2001a], there exists a large $M > 0$ such that with probability $1 - \varepsilon$ there exists a right-side sequence of knots contained in any interval of length $\ge M$ that lies in $[0, \infty)$ and a left-side sequence of knots in any interval of length $\ge M$ that lies in $(-\infty, 0]$. For any $t > 0$, note that the interval $[t - 2M, t]$ contains an interval of length at least M which lies either entirely in $(-\infty, 0]$ or entirely in $[0, \infty)$. Thus, $[t - 2M, t]$ contains a one-sided sequence of knots, and thus an $s < t$ such that $\widehat{\varphi}^0(s) = \widehat{\varphi}(s)$, with probability $1 - \varepsilon$. Similarly, there exists a one-sided sequence of knots in $[t, t + M]$, and thus an $s > t$ such that $\widehat{\varphi}^0(s) = \widehat{\varphi}(s)$, with probability $1 - \varepsilon$. Thus, for $t > 0$, we have shown (7.78) and (7.79). Similarly, for $t < 0$, we consider intervals $[t - M, t]$ and $[t, t + 2M]$ in which there exist one-sided sequences of knots, which allows us to conclude that $\widehat{\varphi}^0(s) = \widehat{\varphi}(s)$ for an $s > t$ and an $s < t$. □

Lemma 7.16. *Let the assumptions of Theorem 5.6 hold. For all $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists M_ε, not depending on t, such that*

$$P\left(|\widehat{\varphi}^0(t) - \widehat{\varphi}(t)| > M_\varepsilon\right) < \varepsilon \text{ and } P\left(|(\widehat{\varphi}^0)'(t) - \widehat{\varphi}'(t)| > M_\varepsilon\right) < \varepsilon, \tag{7.82}$$

where the derivatives can be taken to be right or left derivatives.

Proof. This follows from Lemma 7.14 and an argument similar to the finite sample tightness results. The proof of the second statement in (7.82) is analogous to the proof of (5.2). We can pick, by Corollary 7.15, $t-2M < s_{-2} < s_{-1} < t < s_1 < s_2 < t+2M$ where $\widehat{\varphi}^0(s_i) = \widehat{\varphi}(s_i)$ for $i = -2, -1, 1, 2$, with probability $1-\varepsilon$ for M appropriately large. Then

$$(\widehat{\varphi}^0)'(t) \le \frac{\widehat{\varphi}^0(s_2) - \widehat{\varphi}^0(s_1)}{s_2 - s_1} = \frac{\widehat{\varphi}(s_2) - \widehat{\varphi}(s_1)}{s_2 - s_1} \le \widehat{\varphi}'(s_2),$$

and, similarly,

$$(\widehat{\varphi}^0)'(t) \ge \widehat{\varphi}'(s_{-2})$$

where $\widehat{\varphi}'$ and $(\widehat{\varphi}^0)'$ can be either the left or right derivatives. Thus

$$(\widehat{\varphi}^0)'(t) - \widehat{\varphi}'(t) \le \widehat{\varphi}'(s_2) - \widehat{\varphi}'(t) \le \widehat{\varphi}'(s_2) - \widehat{\varphi}'(s_{-2})$$

and

$$(\widehat{\varphi}^0)'(t) - \widehat{\varphi}'(t) \ge \widehat{\varphi}'(s_{-2}) - \widehat{\varphi}'(t) \ge \widehat{\varphi}'(s_{-2}) - \widehat{\varphi}'(s_2),$$

that is,

$$|(\widehat{\varphi}^0)'(t) - \widehat{\varphi}'(t)| \le \widehat{\varphi}'(s_2) - \widehat{\varphi}'(s_{-2}). \tag{7.83}$$

Let $h_0(t) = -12t^2$. With high probability, the right side of (7.83) is bounded by

$$\begin{aligned} &\widehat{\varphi}'(t+2M) - \widehat{\varphi}'(t-2M) \\ &\quad \le |\widehat{\varphi}'(t+2M) - h_0'(t+2M)| + |h_0'(t+2M) - h_0'(t-2M)| \\ &\qquad + |h_0'(t-2M) - \widehat{\varphi}'(t-2M)|, \end{aligned} \tag{7.84}$$

which is less than $M + M + 24 \cdot 2M$ with probability $1-\varepsilon$, independently of t, by (2.36) or (2.37) of Lemma 2.7 on page 1638 of Groeneboom, Jongbloed and Wellner [2001a]. Thus we have shown the second statement in (7.82), which we will now use to show the first statement in (7.82).

We first apply Lemma 8.2 to the difference $|\widehat{\varphi}^0(t) - \widehat{\varphi}(t)|$ by applying (8.1) to both $\widehat{\varphi}^0 - \widehat{\varphi}$ and to $\widehat{\varphi} - \widehat{\varphi}^0$, using the points s_{-1} and s_1 as a and b, respectively. Then by (8.1), we can bound both of these differences if we can bound both

$$(\widehat{\varphi}^0)'(s_1) - (\widehat{\varphi}^0)'(s_{-1}) \le (\widehat{\varphi}^0)'(t+M) - (\widehat{\varphi}^0)'(t-M) \tag{7.85}$$

and

$$\widehat{\varphi}'(s_1) - \widehat{\varphi}'(s_{-1}) \le \widehat{\varphi}'(t+M) - \widehat{\varphi}'(t-M), \tag{7.86}$$

since all the other terms are 0 by the definition of the s_i. Here we can take the derivatives to be either left or right derivatives. As in (7.84), we can bound $(\widehat{\varphi}^0)'(t+M) - (\widehat{\varphi}^0)'(t-M)$ from above by

$$\begin{aligned} &|(\widehat{\varphi}^0)'(t+M) - \widehat{\varphi}'(t+M)| + |\widehat{\varphi}'(t+M) - \widehat{\varphi}'(t-M)| \\ &\quad + |\widehat{\varphi}'(t-M) - (\widehat{\varphi}^0)'(t-M)|. \end{aligned}$$

The first and last terms are bounded by the second statement in (7.82). The middle term is shown to be bounded by (7.84). The middle term also bounds (7.86). All of this is with probability $1-\varepsilon$ and uniformly in t, so we are done. □

For the next lemma, let $h_0(t) = -12t^2$ be the "true" concave function.

Lemma 7.17. *Let the definitions and assumptions of Theorem 5.6 hold. Then, for all $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists M_ε, independent of t, such that*

$$P\left(|\widehat{\varphi}^0(t) - h_0(t)| > M_\varepsilon\right) < \varepsilon \tag{7.87}$$

$$P\left(|(\widehat{\varphi}^0)'(t) - h_0'(t)| > M_\varepsilon\right) < \varepsilon. \tag{7.88}$$

where the derivatives can be right or left derivatives.

Proof. This is immediate from Lemma 2.7, page 1638, of Groeneboom, Jongbloed and Wellner [2001a] and Lemma 7.16. □

We are now in a position to prove Theorem 5.6.

Proof of Theorem 5.6. We define objective functions with variable bounds of integration,

$$\phi_{a,b}(g) = \frac{1}{2}\int_a^b g^2(t)dt - \int_a^b g(t)dX(t), \tag{7.89}$$

where we will always take $a < 0 < b$. For $i = 1, 2$, we will take $H_{L,i}$ and $H_{R,i}$ to satisfy the hypotheses stated in the theorem, and we need to show $H_{L,1} \equiv H_{L,2}$ and $H_{R,1} \equiv H_{R,2}$ almost surely. We will denote $F_{L,i} = -H_{L,i}'$ and $F_{R,i} = H_{R,i}'$ and

$$\varphi_i = H_{L,i}'' = H_{R,i}''. \tag{7.90}$$

We also will use the notation $dF_i(t) = \varphi_i(t)dt$. Now, using that $\varphi_1^2 - \varphi_2^2 = (\varphi_1 - \varphi_2)^2 + 2(\varphi_1 - \varphi_2)\varphi_2$, we see that

$$\phi_{a,b}(\varphi_1) - \phi_{a,b}(\varphi_2) = \frac{1}{2}\int_a^b (\varphi_1(t) - \varphi_2(t))^2\, dt + \int_a^b (\varphi_1(t) - \varphi_2(t))\, d(F_2(t) - X(t)).$$

Now, we specify that a_n^i and b_n^i are knots for φ_i, and, using Lemma 7.10, we take $a_n^2 < a_n^1 < -n < 0 < n < b_n^1 < b_n^2$. Then

$$\phi_{a_n^2,b_n^2}(\varphi_1) - \phi_{a_n^2,b_n^2}(\varphi_2) \geq \frac{1}{2}\int_{a_n^2}^{b_n^2} (\varphi_1(t) - \varphi_2(t))^2\, dt \geq \frac{1}{2}\int_{-n}^{n} (\varphi_1(t) - \varphi_2(t))^2\, dt$$

by Propositions 7.11 and 7.12, and, similarly,

$$\phi_{a_n^1,b_n^1}(\varphi_2) - \phi_{a_n^1,b_n^1}(\varphi_1) \geq \frac{1}{2}\int_{-n}^{n} (\varphi_2(t) - \varphi_1(t))^2\, dt.$$

Now, we see directly from (7.89) that $\phi_{a_n^2,b_n^2}(\varphi_1) - \phi_{a_n^1,b_n^1}(\varphi_1)$ equals

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{1}{2}\int_{a_n^2}^{b_n^2} \varphi_1^2(t)dt - \frac{1}{2}\int_{a_n^1}^{b_n^1} \varphi_1^2(t)dt - \left(\int_{a_n^2}^{b_n^2} \varphi_1(t)dX(t) - \int_{a_n^1}^{b_n^1} \varphi_1(t)dX(t)\right) \\
&\quad = \frac{1}{2}\int_{A_n} \varphi_1^2(t)dt - \int_{A_n} \varphi_1(t)dX(t),
\end{aligned}$$

where $A_n = [a_n^2, a_n^1] \cup [b_n^1, b_n^2]$. Thus we have

$$\int_{-n}^{n} (\varphi_1(t) - \varphi_2(t))^2 \, dt \leq \phi_{a_n^2, b_n^2}(\varphi_1) - \phi_{a_n^1, b_n^1}(f_1) - (\phi_{a_n^2, b_n^2}(\varphi_2) - \phi_{a_n^1, b_n^1}(f_2))$$
$$= \frac{1}{2} \int_{A_n} \left(\varphi_1(t)^2 - \varphi_2(t)^2\right) dt - \int_{A_n} (\varphi_1(t) - \varphi_2(t)) \, dX(t).$$

Recalling $h_0(t) = 12t^2$, and letting λ denote Lebesgue measure, we see the previous display equals

$$\int_{A_n} \left(\frac{1}{2}\varphi_1^2 - \varphi_1 h_0 + \frac{1}{2}h_0^2 - \frac{1}{2}h_0^2 - (\frac{1}{2}\varphi_2^2 - \varphi_2 h_0 + \frac{1}{2}h_0^2 - \frac{1}{2}h_0^2 \right) d\lambda - (\varphi_1 - \varphi_2) \, dW$$
$$= \int_{A_n} \frac{1}{2} \left((\varphi_1 - h_0)^2 - (\varphi_2 - h_0)^2 \right) d\lambda - (\varphi_1 - \varphi_2) \, dW.$$

Thus we can conclude that

$$0 \leq \lim_n \int_{-n}^{n} (\varphi_1 - \varphi_2)^2 \, d\lambda$$
$$\leq \liminf_n \left(\frac{1}{2} \int_{A_n} \left((\varphi_1 - h_0)^2 - (\varphi_2 - h_0)^2 \right) d\lambda - \int_{A_n} (\varphi_1 - \varphi_2) \, dW \right). \tag{7.91}$$

The proof will now proceed as follows. We first will show that the right hand side of (7.91) is finite. For a function $g\colon \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$, we let $\|g\|_a^b = \sup_{t\in[a,b]} |g(t)|$ and $\|g\|_a^\infty = \sup_{t\in[a,\infty)} |g(t)|$. Using that $\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} (\varphi_1 - \varphi_2)^2 \, d\lambda$ is finite we will then conclude that $||\varphi_1(t) - \varphi_2(t)||_n^\infty \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$. We then will revisit our earlier argument which showed the right hand side of (7.91) was finite and use this new fact to show that (7.91) is, in fact, 0. This will finish the proof.

Thus, our next step is to show that $\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} (\varphi_1(t) - \varphi_2(t))^2 \, dt < \infty$. Note that we only need to control the $\liminf_n$ of the right hand side of (7.91) since $\int_{-n}^{n} (\varphi_1 - \varphi_2)^2 \, d\lambda$ is non-negative and non-decreasing in n. We will first show that $\int_{b_n^1}^{b_n^2} (\varphi_1 - \varphi_2) \, dW < \infty$. An identical argument shows $\int_{a_n^1}^{a_n^2} (f_1 - f_2) dW < \infty$. By integration by parts,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{b_n^1}^{b_n^2} (\varphi_1 - \varphi_2)(u) dW(u) &= \int_{b_n^1}^{b_n^2} (\varphi_1 - \varphi_2)(u) d(W(u) - W(b_n^1)) \\ &= \left(W(b_n^2) - W(b_n^1)\right) \left(\varphi_1(b_n^2) - \varphi_2(b_n^2)\right) \\ &\quad - \int_{b_n^1}^{b_n^2} \left(W(u) - W(b_n^1)\right) \left(\varphi_1'(u) - \varphi_2'(u)\right) du \end{aligned} \tag{7.92}$$

where we can take φ_i' to be the right-derivative, but this choice is inconsequential because of the almost sure continuity of W. Thus, by (7.97) and (7.98), for all n, with probability $1 - \varepsilon$, we can conclude that

$$\left| \int_{b_n^1}^{b_n^2} (\varphi_1 - \varphi_2)(u) dW(u) \right| \leq K_\varepsilon \left(\left| W(b_n^2) - W(b_n^1) \right| + \left| \int_{b_n^1}^{b_n^2} (W(u) - W(b_n^1)) du \right| \right).$$

Lemma 7.18 shows for $i = 1, 2$ that $\int_{b_n^1}^{b_n^2}(\varphi_i - h_0)^2 d\lambda < K_{\varepsilon,2}$ with probability $1-\varepsilon$. Thus since, by (7.96), $\left(\left|W(b_n^2) - W(b_n^1)\right| + \left|\int_{b_n^1}^{b_n^2}(W(u) - W(b_n^1))du\right|\right)$ is $O_p(1)$, and since this argument is perfectly symmetrical and applies to the interval $[a_n^1, a_n^2]$, we have now shown that the right hand side of (7.91) is $O_p(1)$ and thus finite almost surely, as desired.

Now that we have shown that $\int_{-\infty}^{\infty}(\varphi_1 - \varphi_2)^2 d\lambda < \infty$ almost surely, we can conclude that

$$\|\varphi_1 - \varphi_2\|_n^{\infty} \to 0 \tag{7.93}$$

almost surely as $n \to \infty$, and now using (7.93) with arguments similar to those used above, we will show $\int_{-\infty}^{\infty}(\varphi_1 - \varphi_2)^2 d\lambda = 0$ almost surely. By (7.93), Lemma 7.18 below allows us to conclude that almost surely $\int_{b_n^1}^{b_n^2} |\varphi_1' - h_0'| d\lambda \to 0$. Thus we can reexamine (7.92) and see that the right side is bounded above by

$$\left|W(b_n^2) - W(b_n^1)\right| \left|\varphi_1(b_n^2) - \varphi_2(b_n^2)\right| + ||W(\cdot) - W(b_n^1)||_{b_n^1}^{b_n^2} \int_{b_n^1}^{b_n^2} |\varphi_1'(u) - \varphi_2'(u)| du$$
$$\leq \varepsilon \left(\left|W(b_n^2) - W(b_n^1)\right| + ||W(\cdot) - W(b_n^1)||_{b_n^1}^{b_n^2}\right),$$

where we may choose n large enough to make the inequality occur with probability $1-\varepsilon$ for any positive ε. Thus, since $\left(\left|W(b_n^2) - W(b_n^1)\right| + ||W(\cdot) - W(b_n^1)||_{b_n^1}^{b_n^2}\right) = O_p(1)$, we have shown that we may choose n large enough that with probability $1 - \varepsilon$

$$\left|\int_{b_n^1}^{b_n^2} (\varphi_1(u) - \varphi_2(u))\, dW(u)\right| \leq \varepsilon. \tag{7.94}$$

Next we show that the other term in (7.91), $\int_{A_n}\left((\varphi_1 - h_0)^2 - (\varphi_2 - h_0)^2\right) d\lambda/2$, is small. By Lemma 7.18, for any $\varepsilon > 0$ we may pick an M_ε such that both $|\int_{b_n^1}^{b_n^2}(\varphi_1 - h_0)\, d\lambda|$ and $b_n^2 - b_n^1$ are bounded by M_ε with probability $1 - \varepsilon$. Thus, defining $\varepsilon_2 = \varepsilon/M_\varepsilon$ we take n large enough such that with probability $1 - \varepsilon$ we have $||\varphi_1 - \varphi_2||_n^{\infty} < \varepsilon_2$. Then let $\delta(t) = \varphi_1(t) - \varphi_2(t)$ and conclude that

$$\int_{b_n^1}^{b_n^2}(\varphi_1 - h_0)^2 d\lambda = \int_{b_n^1}^{b_n^2}(\varphi_2 - h_0 + \delta)^2 d\lambda$$
$$\leq \int_{b_n^1}^{b_n^2}(\varphi_2 - h_0)^2 d\lambda + 2\varepsilon_2 \int_{b_n^1}^{b_n^2} |\varphi_2 - h_0| d\lambda + \varepsilon_2^2(b_n^2 - b_n^1),$$

and that the above display is bounded above by

$$\int_{b_n^1}^{b_n^2}(\varphi_2 - h_0)^2\, d\lambda + \varepsilon + \left(\frac{\varepsilon}{M_\varepsilon}\right)^2 M_\varepsilon \leq \int_{b_n^1}^{b_n^2}(\varphi_2 - h_0)^2\, d\lambda + 2\varepsilon,$$

with probability $1-2\varepsilon$ and n large enough. Similarly, $\int_{b_n^1}^{b_n^2}(\varphi_2-h_0)^2d\lambda \leq \int_{b_n^1}^{b_n^2}(\varphi_1-h_0)^2d\lambda+2\varepsilon$, and thus

$$\left|\frac{1}{2}\int_{A_n}\left((\varphi_1-h_0)^2-(\varphi_2-h_0)^2\right)d\lambda\right|\leq\varepsilon \tag{7.95}$$

with probability $1-2\varepsilon$. Thus we have shown that with probability approaching 1 both terms in (7.91) are bounded by ε as n goes to infinity. Thus since $\int_{-n}^{n}(\varphi_1-\varphi_2)^2d\lambda$ is non decreasing in n, $\int_{-n}^{n}(\varphi_1-\varphi_2)^2d\lambda<\varepsilon$ with probability $1-\varepsilon$ and thus it must be 0 almost surely. □

The following lemma translates Lemma 7.17 into a more direct tightness result.

Lemma 7.18. *Let the definitions and assumptions of Theorem 5.6 hold and let $h_0(t)=-12t^2$. Let φ_i, $i=1,2$, be as in (7.90) and a_n^i and b_n^i as defined on page 59. We then have*

$$b_n^2-b_n^1=O_p(1). \tag{7.96}$$

Furthermore, for $i=1,2$ and any $\varepsilon>0$ and $k>0$, there exist $K_\varepsilon, K_{\varepsilon,k}>0$ such that with probability greater than $1-\varepsilon$ we have

$$||\varphi_i-h_0||_{b_n^1}^{b_n^2}<K_\varepsilon \tag{7.97}$$

$$||\varphi_i'-h_0'||_{b_n^1}^{b_n^2}<K_\varepsilon, \tag{7.98}$$

(in which we take φ_i' to be either the right of the left derivative) and thus that

$$\int_{b_n^1}^{b_n^2}|\varphi_i-h_0|^k d\lambda<K_{\varepsilon,k}, \tag{7.99}$$

where K_ε and $K_{\varepsilon,k}$ do not depend on n. Further, if almost surely $\|\varphi_1-\varphi_2\|_n^\infty\to 0$ as $n\to\infty$ then we can conclude that almost surely

$$\int_{b_n^1}^{b_n^2}|(\varphi_i)'-h_0'|\,d\lambda\to 0 \tag{7.100}$$

as $n\to\infty$, for $i=1,2$. The statements also hold if we replace b_n^1 by a_n^2 and b_n^2 by a_n^1.

Proof. (7.96) follows immediately from Lemma 7.14.

Next we will show (7.97) and (7.98). Let g_1 and g_0 be monotone functions. Then for any $t\in[a,b]$, we have that

$$g_1(t)-g_0(t)\leq g_1(b)-g_0(a)=g_1(b)-g_0(b)+g_0(b)-g_0(a)$$

and similarly $g_0(t)-g_1(t)\leq g_0(b)-g_0(a)+g_1(a)-g_0(a)$. Thus

$$|(g_1-g_0)(t)|\leq|(g_1-g_0)(b)|+|(g_1-g_0)(a)|+g_0(b)-g_0(a).$$

By monotonicity and Lemma 7.17, we can say

$$||\varphi_i' - h_0'||_{b_n^1}^{b_n^2} < 2M_\varepsilon + h_0'(n + M_\varepsilon) - h_0'(n) = 2M_\varepsilon + 24M_\varepsilon,$$

where φ_i' refers to either the left or the right derivative. This is independent of n thanks to the linearity of h_0'. Thus we have shown (7.98).

Now we establish (7.97). Fix $i \in \{1, 2\}$. We will apply Lemma 8.2 twice, with φ_i as g_1 and h_0 as g_0, and then with the reverse assignments. We let $[a, b] = [n, n + M]$. Regardless of the choice of which is g_1 and which is g_0, we can bound the first two terms in (8.1), the weighted differences $\lambda(g_1(n + M) - g_0(n+M)) + (1-\lambda)(g_1(n) - g_0(n))$, by $2M_\varepsilon$ with probability $1-\varepsilon$, independently of n, by Lemma 7.17. If h_0 is g_0 then for the third term of (8.1) we have to bound $(h_0'(n+) - h_0'(n + M-)) = 24M$ which is independent of n. If φ_i is g_0, then for the third term of (8.1) we have that $|\varphi_i'(n+M-) - \varphi_i'(n+))|$ is bounded above by

$$|\varphi_i'(n + M-) - h_0'(n + M)| + |h_0'(n) - \varphi_i'(n+)| + h_0'(n + M) - h_0'(n)$$

which we can again bound independently of n by the linearity of h_0' and Lemma 7.17 with probability $1 - \varepsilon$. Since $[b_n^1, b_n^2] \subset [n, n + M]$ with probability $1 - \varepsilon$ for appropriately large M, and since $(n + M - t)(t - n)/M \leq (M/2)^2/M$ which is independent of n and t, the bound is independent of n or t. Thus we have shown (7.97). Then (7.99) follows immediately from (7.97) and (7.96), since we can bound $\int_{b_n^1}^{b_n^2} |\varphi_i - h_0|^k d\lambda \leq \int_{b_n^1}^{b_n^2} K_\varepsilon^k d\lambda \leq K_\varepsilon^k \cdot K_\varepsilon$, with probability $1 - \varepsilon$.

Finally, we show that if for a random outcome ω, $||\varphi_1^\omega - \varphi_2^\omega||_n^\infty \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$ then (7.100) follows. First, note for any a, b that if $\varepsilon < \int_a^b ((\varphi_i^\omega)' - h_0')d\lambda = (\varphi_i^\omega - h_0)(b) - (\varphi_i^\omega - h_0)(a)$, and if $(\varphi_i^\omega - h_0)(b) > \varepsilon/2$ then $(\varphi_i^\omega - h_0)(a) < -\varepsilon/2$. Similarly, if $-\varepsilon > \int_a^b ((\varphi_i^\omega)' - h_0')d\lambda$ we can conclude that $(\varphi_i^\omega - h_0)$ at a or at b is larger than $\varepsilon/2$ in absolute value. Since we can take n large enough that $|\varphi_i^\omega - h_0|$ is less than $\varepsilon/2$ at any $a, b > n$, by contradiction we have that $|\int_a^b ((\varphi_i^\omega)' - h_0')d\lambda| < \varepsilon$ for such a and b. Now, since $\{t \in [b_n^1, b_n^2) : (\varphi_1^\omega)'(t) > (\varphi_2^\omega)'(t)\}$ and $\{t \in [b_n^1, b_n^2) : (\varphi_1^\omega)'(t) \leq (\varphi_2^\omega)'(t)\}$ are both intervals by monotonicity of $(\varphi_1^\omega)'$ and linearity of $(\varphi_2^\omega)'$ on $[b_n^1, b_n^2]$, we can conclude that $\int_a^b |(\varphi_i^\omega)' - h_0'|d\lambda < \varepsilon$ as desired. □

7.3.3. Proofs for pointwise limit theory

Theorem 5.8 about the unconstrained estimator is Theorem 2.1 of Balabdaoui, Rufibach and Wellner [2009]. Theorem 5.9 (B) is then proved in an identical fashion as that theorem, because for n large enough, in an $n^{-1/5}$ neighborhood of $x_0 \neq m$, the constrained and unconstrained estimators satisfy the same characterization. Thus we focus on proving Theorem 5.9 (A), where $x_0 = m$. In this subsection we will state and prove a more general version of that theorem (and of Theorem 5.8) that applies to our estimators in $n^{-1/5}$ neighborhoods of x_0.

Recall the definition of Y in (5.9). Now, for positive numbers a and σ, Let

$$Y_{a,\sigma}(t) \equiv \sigma \int_0^t W(s)ds - at^4 \stackrel{d}{=} \sigma(\sigma/a)^{3/5} Y((a/\sigma)^{2/5}t), \tag{7.101}$$

$$Y^{(1)}_{a,\sigma}(t) = \sigma W(t) - 4at^3 \stackrel{d}{=} \sigma(a/\sigma)^{1/5} Y^{(1)}((a/\sigma)^{2/5}t). \tag{7.102}$$

Let $H_{a,\sigma}, H_{L,a,\sigma}$, and $H_{R,a,\sigma}$ denote the unconstrained and mode-constrained left- and right-processes for $Y_{a,\sigma}$. Then

$$H_{a,\sigma}(t) \stackrel{d}{=} \sigma(\sigma/a)^{3/5} H((a/\sigma)^{2/5}t),$$
$$H^{(1)}_{a,\sigma}(t) \stackrel{d}{=} \sigma(\sigma/a)^{1/5} H^{(1)}((a/\sigma)^{2/5}t),$$

and

$$\widehat{\varphi}_{a,\sigma} \quad = \quad H^{(2)}_{a,\sigma} \stackrel{d}{=} \sigma^{4/5} a^{1/5} H^{(2)}((a/\sigma)^{2/5}\cdot) \tag{7.103}$$

Identical scaling relationships hold for $H_{L,a,\sigma}, H_{R,a,\sigma}$, and the corresponding derivatives, including $\widehat{\varphi}^0_{a,\sigma} \equiv H^{(2)}_{R,a,\sigma}$:

$$\widehat{\varphi}^0_{a,\sigma} \quad = \quad H^{(2)}_{R,a,\sigma} \stackrel{d}{=} \sigma^{4/5} a^{1/5} H^{(2)}_R((a/\sigma)^{2/5}\cdot) \tag{7.104}$$

Theorem 7.19. *Let Assumption 1 hold. Let H be as in Theorem 5.5 and let $\widehat{\varphi} \equiv H''$ and let $\widehat{\varphi}^0$ be as in Theorem 5.6. Let $\sigma \equiv 1/\sqrt{f_0(m)}$ and $a = |\varphi_0^{(2)}(m)|/4!$. Then*

$$\begin{pmatrix} n^{2/5}(\widehat{\varphi}_n(m+n^{-1/5}t) - \varphi_0(m)) \\ n^{1/5}(\widehat{\varphi}'_n(m+n^{-1/5}t) - \varphi_0'(m)) \\ n^{2/5}(\widehat{\varphi}^0_n(m+n^{-1/5}t) - \varphi_0(m)) \\ n^{1/5}((\widehat{\varphi}^0_n)'(m+n^{-1/5}t) - \varphi_0'(m)) \end{pmatrix} \stackrel{d}{\to} \begin{pmatrix} \widehat{\varphi}_{a,\sigma}(t) \\ \widehat{\varphi}'_{a,\sigma}(t) \\ \widehat{\varphi}^0_{a,\sigma}(t) \\ (\widehat{\varphi}^0_{a,\sigma})'(t) \end{pmatrix}$$

as processes in $(\mathcal{C}_\infty \times \mathcal{D}_\infty)^2$, where $\mathcal{C}_\infty$ is the set of continuous functions on $(-\infty,\infty)$ with the topology of uniform convergence on compacta and $\mathcal{D}_\infty$ is the set of right-continuous with limits from the left ("cadlag") functions on $(-\infty,\infty)$ with the topology of M_1 convergence on compacta. (The M_1 topology is discussed in detail on page 73).

Before proving Theorem 7.19, we show that it proves (5.21).

Proof of (5.21). Note that, now with $\sigma = 1/\sqrt{f_0(m)}$ and $a = |\varphi_0^{(2)}(m)|/4!$, (7.104) equals

$$\frac{1}{\gamma_1\gamma_2^2} H^{(2)}_R(\cdot/\gamma_2) \equiv \frac{1}{\gamma_1\gamma_2^2}\widehat{\varphi}^0(\cdot/\gamma_2), \tag{7.105}$$

where

$$\gamma_1 = \left(\frac{f_0(m)^4|\varphi_0^{(2)}(m)|^3}{(4!)^3}\right)^{1/5} = \frac{1}{\sigma}\left(\frac{a}{\sigma}\right)^{3/5}, \tag{7.106}$$

$$\gamma_2 = \left(\frac{(4!)^2}{f_0(m)|\varphi_0^{(2)}(m)|^2}\right)^{1/5} = \left(\frac{\sigma}{a}\right)^{2/5}, \tag{7.107}$$

and we note that

$$\gamma_1\gamma_2^{3/2} = \sigma^{-1} = \sqrt{f_0(m)}, \quad \gamma_1\gamma_2^4 = a^{-1} = \frac{4!}{|\varphi_0^{(2)}(m)|}, \tag{7.108}$$

$$\frac{1}{\gamma_1\gamma_2^2} = C(m,\varphi_0) \equiv \left(\frac{4! f_0(m)^2}{|\varphi_0^{(2)}(m)|}\right)^{-1/5}. \tag{7.109}$$

This gives the constant in the limit distribution for $\widehat{\varphi}_n^0(m)$. For $(\widehat{\varphi}_n^0)'(m)$, we see from (7.105) that

$$(\widehat{\varphi}_{a,\sigma}^0)' =_d \frac{1}{\gamma_1\gamma_2^3}(\widehat{\varphi}^0)'(\cdot/\gamma_2), \tag{7.110}$$

and $1/\gamma_1\gamma_2^3 = D(m,\varphi_0)$. Thus (5.21) follows from Theorem 7.19. □

The delta method can now be used to show (5.20); but this will effectively be done during the proof of Theorem 7.19. Thus we postpone showing (5.20) and begin proving Theorem 7.19, to which we devote ourselves for the entire remainder of this subsection. All the lemmas contained in the proof use the same notation, and have the same hypotheses as the theorem (i.e., Assumption 1 holds).

Proof of Theorem 7.19. We will define two sets of localized processes, corresponding to the empirical process and to the estimator. We will begin with "f-processes," at the density level, where the empirical process theory applies. These are related (effectively by the delta method) to our "φ-processes" which is where the shape constraint comes forth. We will let $b \in \mathbb{R}$ denote our "local" parameter and let

$$t_{n,b} \equiv m + bn^{-1/5} \tag{7.111}$$

be the "global" parameter. We also let $s_{n,L}$ be any knot (sequence) of $\widehat{\varphi}_n^0$ strictly less than m satisfying $n^{1/5}(s_{n,L} - m) = O_p(1)$ and let $s_{n,R}$ be any knot (sequence) of $\widehat{\varphi}_n^0$ strictly larger than m satisfying $n^{1/5}(s_{n,R} - m) = O_p(1)$. Recall λ is Lebesgue measure, and define the f-processes as

$$\mathbb{Y}_n^f(b) \equiv n^{4/5}\int_m^{t_{n,b}} \left(\int_m^v (d\mathbb{F}_n - f_0(m)d\lambda)\right) dv,$$
$$\widehat{H}_n^f(b) \equiv n^{4/5}\int_m^{t_{n,b}} \left(\int_m^v (\widehat{f}_n - f_0(m))d\lambda\right) dv + A_n b + B_n,$$

and

$$\mathbb{Y}^f_{n,L}(b) \equiv n^{4/5} \int_{t_{n,b}}^{s_{n,L}} \left(\int_v^{s_{n,L}} (d\mathbb{F}_n - f_0(m)d\lambda) \right) dv,$$

$$\mathbb{Y}^f_{n,R}(b) \equiv n^{4/5} \int_{s_{n,R}}^{t_{n,b}} \left(\int_{s_{n,R}}^{v} (d\mathbb{F}_n - f_0(m)d\lambda) \right) dv,$$

$$\widehat{H}^f_{n,L}(b) \equiv n^{4/5} \int_{t_{n,b}}^{s_{n,L}} \left(\int_v^{s_{n,L}} (\widehat{f}^0_n - f_0(m))d\lambda \right) dv + A_{n,L} n^{1/5}(s_{n,L} - t_{n,b}),$$

$$\widehat{H}^f_{n,R}(b) \equiv n^{4/5} \int_{s_{n,R}}^{t_{n,b}} \left(\int_{s_{n,R}}^{v} (\widehat{f}^0_n - f_0(m))d\lambda \right) dv + A_{n,R} n^{1/5}(t_{n,b} - s_{n,R}),$$

where

$$A_n = n^{3/5} \left(\widehat{F}_n(m) - \mathbb{F}_n(m) \right) \quad \text{and} \quad B_n = n^{4/5} \left(\widehat{H}_n(m) - \mathbb{Y}_n(m) \right),$$

and

$$A_{n,L} = n^{3/5} \left(\mathbb{F}_{n,L}(s_{n,L}) - \widehat{F}^0_{n,L}(s_{n,L}) \right), \tag{7.112}$$

$$A_{n,R} = n^{3/5} \left(\mathbb{F}_{n,R}(s_{n,R}) - \widehat{F}^0_{n,R}(s_{n,R}) \right) \tag{7.113}$$

(recalling the definitions of $\mathbb{F}_{n,L}$ and $\mathbb{F}_{n,R}$ from (2.5)). Additionally, let

$$\mathbb{X}^f_n(b) := (\mathbb{Y}^f_n)'(b) = n^{3/5} \int_m^{t_{n,b}} (d\mathbb{F}_n - f_0(m)d\lambda),$$

$$\mathbb{X}^f_{n,L}(b) := -(\mathbb{Y}^f_{n,L})'(b) = n^{3/5} \int_{t_{n,b}}^{s_{n,L}} (d\mathbb{F}_n - f_0(m)d\lambda),$$

$$\mathbb{X}^f_{n,R}(b) := (\mathbb{Y}^f_{n,R})'(b) = n^{3/5} \int_{s_{n,R}}^{t_{n,b}} (d\mathbb{F}_n - f_0(m)d\lambda).$$

The terms for the constrained processes which would correspond to B_n turn out to be 0. Also, $A_{n,L}$ and $A_{n,R}$ appear to be off by a sign change when compared with A_n: this is because of the definitions of our left- and right-processes, which entails, e.g., $(\widehat{H}^0_{n,R} - \mathbb{Y}_{n,R})'(t) = -(\widehat{F}^0_{n,R} - \mathbb{F}_{n,R})(t)$. Note that in Balabdaoui, Rufibach and Wellner [2009], $\mathbb{Y}^f_n$ is denoted by $\mathbb{Y}^{loc}_n$ and similarly for $\widehat{H}^f_n$.

The proof proceeds as follows. We will derive the limit distribution for the empirical process-type $\mathbb{Y}$ and $\mathbb{X}$ terms. We will show that the estimator-type H terms (and appropriate derivatives) are tight, and also satisfy characterizations analogous to those given in Theorem 5.5 and Theorem 5.6. We argue then (by a continuous mapping argument) that a characterization must hold in the limit (along subsequences, using tightness of the H processes) and then apply Theorem 5.5 and Theorem 5.6 to conclude that the limit is as desired.

For $0 < c \leq \infty$, define

$$\mathcal{C}_c = \{h | h : [-c, c] \to \mathbb{R}, h \text{ is continuous}\}$$

$$\mathcal{D}_c = \{h | h : (-c, c) \to \mathbb{R}, h \text{ is cadlag and bounded}\},$$

where "cadlag" means right-continuous functions which have limits from the left. If $c = \infty$ then we we interpret the definition of $\mathcal{C}_\infty$ to mean continuous functions h defined on $(-\infty, \infty)$. We let $\|f\|$ be the supremum of f over its domain, and this is the distance we use in $\mathcal{C}_c$ when $c < \infty$. When $c = \infty$ we use the topology of convergence on all compacta (see Whitt [1970]). For $\mathcal{D}_c$ the uniform norm is too strong, so generally one uses a Skorokhod norm (Skorokhod [1956], see also Billingsley [1999]). We endow, for the moment, $\mathcal{D}_c$ with the J_1 Skorokhod norm (referred to as "the" Skorokhod topology in chapter 12 of Billingsley [1999]). When we come to proving tightness of our H-type processes we will further discuss topological details. Now we focus on the empirical processes. We let "$A_n \Rightarrow A$" mean that A_n converges weakly to A in a space that will be specified in each context [Billingsley, 1999]. The proof of the following lemma is standard but we will refer to it several times so we provide it here. Recall $t_{n,b} = m + bn^{-1/5}$, for $b \in \mathbb{R}$, and recall that $s_{n,L}, s_{n,R}$ are chosen to be of order $n^{-1/5}$ from m in probability. Let $\mathbb{D}_n = \mathbb{F}_n - F_0$, and define processes $\underline{\mathbb{A}}_n(b) \equiv (\mathbb{A}_{n,1}(b), \mathbb{A}_{n,2}(b), \mathbb{A}_{n,3}(b))$ and $\underline{\mathbb{B}}_n(b) \equiv (\mathbb{B}_{n,1}(b), \mathbb{B}_{n,2}(b), \mathbb{B}_{n,3}(b))$ for $b \in \mathbb{R}$ by

$$\underline{\mathbb{A}}_n(b) \equiv \frac{n^{3/5}}{\sqrt{f_0(m)}} \left(\int_m^{t_{n,b}} d\mathbb{D}_n, \int_{t_{n,b}}^{s_{n,L}} d\mathbb{D}_n, \int_{s_{n,R}}^{t_{n,b}} d\mathbb{D}_n \right),$$

and

$$\underline{\mathbb{B}}_n(b) \equiv \frac{n^{4/5}}{\sqrt{f_0(m)}} \left(\int_m^{t_{n,b}} \int_m^v d\mathbb{D}_n dv, \int_{t_{n,b}}^{s_{n,L}} \int_v^{s_{n,L}} d\mathbb{D}_n dv, \int_{s_{n,R}}^{t_{n,b}} \int_{s_{n,R}}^v d\mathbb{D}_n dv \right).$$

Let $\nu_{n,R} = n^{1/5}(s_{n,R} - m)$ and $\nu_{n,L} = n^{1/5}(s_{n,L} - m)$. For a (sequence of) Brownian motion processes $W \equiv W_n$ on $\mathbb{R}$ we also define corresponding approximating (nearly Gaussian) processes $\underline{G}_n \equiv (G_{n,1}, \ldots, G_{n,6})$ by

$$(G_{n,1}, G_{n,2}, G_{n,3}) = \left(\int_0^b dW, \int_b^{\nu_{n,L}} dW, \int_{\nu_{n,R}}^b dW \right),$$

and

$$(G_{n,4}, G_{n,5}, G_{n,6}) = \left(\int_0^b \int_0^v dW dv, \int_b^{\nu_{n,L}} \int_v^{\nu_{n,L}} dW dv, \int_{\nu_{n,R}}^b \int_{\nu_{n,R}}^v dW dv \right).$$

Lemma 7.20. *The vector of processes $(\mathbb{A}_n(b), \mathbb{B}_n(b))$ can be defined on a common probability space with a sequence of Brownian motion processes $W \equiv W_n$ so that*

$$\sup_{b \in [-c,c]} |(\mathbb{A}_n(b), \mathbb{B}_n(b)) - \underline{G}_n(b)| \to_p 0.$$

Proof. We prove that the difference of $\mathbb{A}_{n,1}(b) = n^{3/5} \int_m^{t_{n,b}} d\mathbb{D}_n$ and $G_{n,1}$ converges to 0 in probability uniformly in $|b| \le c$ and that the difference of $\mathbb{B}_{n,1}(b) = n^{4/5} \int_m^{t_{n,b}} \int_m^v d\mathbb{D}_n dv$ and $G_{n,4}(b)$ converges to 0 in probability uniformly in $|b| \le$

c. The proofs for the other components are analogous. We can see $n^{3/5}\int_m^{t_{n,b}} d\mathbb{D}_n$ is equal in distribution to

$$n^{1/10}\left(\mathbb{U}_n(F_0(t_{n,b})) - \mathbb{U}_n(F_0(m))\right) \tag{7.114}$$

where $\mathbb{U}_n(t) \equiv \sqrt{n}(\mathbb{F}_n^*(t) - t)$ is the empirical process corresponding to $\mathbb{F}_n^*(t)$, the empirical d.f. for n i.i.d. uniform random variables. By a Skorokhod construction (see e.g. Theorem 12.3.4, page 502, of Shorack and Wellner [2009]; or see Mason and van Zwet [1987]) there exist a sequence of Brownian bridge processes B_n such that $\|\mathbb{U}_n - B_n\| = O(\log(n)n^{-1/2})$ almost surely. Thus, (7.114) is equal to

$$n^{1/10}(B_n(F_0(t_{n,b})) - B_n(F_0(m))) + n^{-4/10}\log(n)M_n(b), \tag{7.115}$$

where for all $|b| \le c$, $0 \le M_n(b) \le M = O(1)$ almost surely. Next we use that $B_n(t) = W_n(t) - tW_n(1)$ where $W_n(t) = B_n(t) + tN$ is a Brownian motion and N is a standard Normal random variable. Thus (7.115) equals

$$n^{1/10}\left(W_n(F_0(t_{n,b})) - W_n(F_0(m)) - (F_0(t_{n,b}) - F_0(m))W_n(1)\right) + o_p(1),$$

which is equal to

$$\begin{aligned} &W_n(b)\sqrt{n^{1/5}(F_0(t_{n,b}) - F_0(m))/b} - W_n(1)f_0(m)bn^{-1/10} + o_p(1) \\ &\quad = W_n(b)\sqrt{f_0(m)} + o_p(1). \end{aligned}$$

This shows that $\sup_{b\in[-c,c]}|\mathbb{A}_{n,1}(b) - G_{n,1}(b)| = o_p(1)$. Using this, we see that the process $n^{4/5}\int_m^{t_{n,b}}\int_m^v d\mathbb{D}_n dv$ defined on this probability space equals

$$n^{1/5}\int_m^{t_{n,b}}\left(\sqrt{f_0(m)}W_n(n^{1/5}(v-m)) + o_p(1)\right)dv = \sqrt{f_0(m)}\int_0^b W_n(v)dv + o_p(1)$$

with the $o_p(1)$ error still uniform in $|b| \le c$. Thus $\sup_{b\in[-c,c]}|\mathbb{B}_{n,1}(b) - G_{n,4}(b)| = o_p(1)$. This completes the proof for two of the terms and the other four are analogous. □

Lemma 7.21. *Let $\underline{P}_n \equiv (P_{n,1},\ldots,P_{n,6})$ be a vector of drift terms where we let*

$$\begin{aligned} P_{n,1}(b) &= \frac{1}{6}b^3, & P_{n,2}(b) &= \int_b^{n^{1/5}(s_{n,L}-m)}\frac{1}{2}u^2du, \\ P_{n,3}(b) &= \int_{n^{1/5}(s_{n,R}-m)}^b \frac{1}{2}u^2du, & P_{n,4}(b) &= \frac{1}{24}b^4, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} P_{n,5}(b) &= \int_b^{n^{1/5}(s_{n,L}-m)}\int_v^{n^{1/5}(s_{n,L}-m)}\frac{1}{2}u^2dudv, \\ P_{n,6}(b) &= \int_{n^{1/5}(s_{n,L}-m)}^b\int_{n^{1/5}(s_{n,L}-m)}^v\frac{1}{2}u^2dudv. \end{aligned}$$

Then the vector of processes $(\underline{\mathbb{X}}_n^f, \underline{\mathbb{Y}}_n^f) \equiv \left(\mathbb{X}_n^f, \mathbb{X}_{n,L}^f, \mathbb{X}_{n,R}^f, \mathbb{Y}_n^f, \mathbb{Y}_{n,L}^f, \mathbb{Y}_{n,R}^f\right)$ *can be defined on a common probability space with a sequence of Brownian motion processes* $W \equiv W_n$ *such that for* $0 < c < \infty$

$$\sup_{b\in[-c,c]} |(\underline{\mathbb{X}}_n^f(b), \underline{\mathbb{Y}}_n^f(b)) - \sqrt{f_0(m)}\underline{G}_n(b) - f_0''(m)\underline{P}_n(b)| \to_p 0 \quad \text{as } n \to \infty,$$

where $\underline{G}_n$ *is as in Lemma 7.20.*

Proof. We will show that the statement holds for $\mathbb{X}_{n,R}^f$. The proof for the other $\mathbb{X}$ terms and for all the $\mathbb{Y}$ terms are similar. Now, $n^{-3/5}\mathbb{X}_{n,R}^f(b)$ equals $\int_{s_{n,R}}^{t_{n,b}} d\mathbb{D}_n + \int_{s_{n,R}}^{t_{n,b}} (f_0 - f_0(m))d\lambda$; by a second-order Taylor expansion of f_0, since $f_0'(m) = 0$, the second term equals

$$\int_{s_{n,R}}^{t_{n,b}} (f_0^{(2)}(m) + o(1))\frac{(w-m)^2}{2}dw = n^{-3/5}(f_0^{(2)}(m) + o(1))\int_{n^{1/5}(s_{n,R}-m)}^{b} \frac{u^2}{2}du$$

where the $o(1)$ is uniform in $|b| \le c$. By Lemma 7.20, we have shown $\mathbb{X}_{n,R}^f$ has the desired limit. □

The next lemma shows that the localized processes still satisfy the characterizing system of equalities/inequalities of the global estimators; once these characterizing equalities/inequalities are carried over to the limit they will allow us to identify the limit distribution, via Theorems 5.5 and 5.6.

Lemma 7.22. *For* $b \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$\mathbb{Y}_{n,L}^f(b) - \widehat{H}_{n,L}^f(b) \ge 0, \tag{7.116}$$

$$\mathbb{Y}_{n,R}^f(b) - \widehat{H}_{n,R}^f(b) \ge 0, \tag{7.117}$$

and

$$\int_{\infty}^{\tau_{n,-}^0} \left(\mathbb{Y}_{n,L}^f(b) - \widehat{H}_{n,L}^f(b)\right) d(\widehat{H}_{n,L}^f)^{(3)}(b) = 0, \tag{7.118}$$

$$\int_{\tau_{n,+}^0}^{\infty} \left(\mathbb{Y}_{n,R}^f(b) - \widehat{H}_{n,R}^f(b)\right) d(\widehat{H}_{n,R}^f)^{(3)}(b) = 0 \tag{7.119}$$

where $\tau_{n,-}^0$ *is the largest left-knot of* $\widehat{\varphi}_n^0$ *(no larger than* m*) and* $\tau_{n,+}^0$ *is the smallest right-knot of* $\widehat{\varphi}_n^0$ *(no smaller than* m*).*

Proof. We consider the right-side process, and the left-side ones are analogous. The difference $\mathbb{Y}_{n,R}^f(b) - \widehat{H}_{n,R}^f(b)$ equals

$$n^{4/5}\int_{s_{n,R}}^{t_{n,b}} \left(\int_{s_{n,R}}^{v} d\mathbb{F}_n - \widehat{f}_n^0 d\lambda\right) dv - (b - n^{1/5}(s_{n,R} - m))A_{n,R},$$

which, by the definition of $A_{n,R}$, equals

$$n^{4/5}\int_{s_{n,R}}^{t_{n,b}}\left(\int_{s_{n,R}}^{X_{(n)}}(d\mathbb{F}_n(u)-\widehat{f}_n^0(u)du)-\int_v^{X_{(n)}}(d\mathbb{F}_n(u)-\widehat{f}_n^0(u)du)\right)dv$$
$$-n^{4/5}\left(t_{n,b}-s_{n,R}\right)\int_{s_{n,R}}^{X_{(n)}}(d\mathbb{F}_n(u)-\widehat{f}_n^0(u)du),$$

which equals

$$-n^{4/5}\int_{s_{n,R}}^{t_{n,b}}\left(\int_v^{X_{(n)}}(d\mathbb{F}_n(u)-\widehat{f}_n^0(u)du)\right)dv,$$

which equals

$$n^{4/5}\int_{t_{n,b}}^{X_{(n)}}\left(\int_v^{X_{(n)}}(d\mathbb{F}_n(u)-\widehat{f}_n^0(u)du)\right)dv, \tag{7.120}$$

since $\widehat{H}^0_{n,R}(s_{n,R})-\mathbb{Y}_{n,R}(s_{n,R})=0$ by Theorem 2.10. Thus,

$$\mathbb{Y}^f_{n,R}(b)-\widehat{H}^f_{n,R}(b)=n^{4/5}\left(\mathbb{Y}_{n,R}(t_{n,b})-\widehat{H}^0_{n,R}(t_{n,b})\right)\geq 0$$

for all $b\geq 0$, with equality if $t_{n,b}$ is a right-knot, by Theorem 2.10. We have thus shown (7.117) and (7.119). Showing (7.116) and (7.118) is analogous. □

In order to show tightness of our H-processes, we want to apply Corollary 5.4, which is at the log-density level. To do this, we need to translate from the f-processes to processes defined at the log level, which we will refer to as φ-processes. Let

$$\mathbb{Y}^\varphi_n(b)=\frac{\mathbb{Y}^f_n(b)}{f_0(m)}-n^{4/5}\int_m^{t_{n,b}}\int_m^v R(u)dudv,$$
$$\widehat{H}^\varphi_n(b)=\frac{\widehat{H}^f_n(b)}{f_0(m)}-n^{4/5}\int_m^{t_{n,b}}\int_m^v R_n(u)dudv,$$
$$\mathbb{Y}^\varphi_{n,L}(b)=\frac{\mathbb{Y}^f_{n,L}(b)}{f_0(m)}-n^{4/5}\int_{t_{n,b}}^{s_{n,L}}\int_v^{s_{n,L}} R^0_n(u)dudv,$$
$$\mathbb{Y}^\varphi_{n,R}(b)=\frac{\mathbb{Y}^f_{n,R}(b)}{f_0(m)}-n^{4/5}\int_{s_{n,R}}^{t_{n,b}}\int_{s_{n,R}}^v R^0_n(u)dudv,$$
$$\widehat{H}^\varphi_{n,L}(b)=\frac{\widehat{H}^f_{n,L}(b)}{f_0(m)}-n^{4/5}\int_{t_{n,b}}^{s_{n,L}}\int_v^{s_{n,L}} R^0_n(u)dudv,$$
$$\widehat{H}^\varphi_{n,R}(b)=\frac{\widehat{H}^f_{n,R}(b)}{f_0(m)}-n^{4/5}\int_{s_{n,R}}^{t_{n,b}}\int_{s_{n,R}}^v R^0_n(u)dudv,$$

where

$$R_n(u) = \sum_{j=2}^{\infty} \frac{1}{j!} \left(\widehat{\varphi}_n(u) - \varphi_0(m)\right)^j, \quad \text{and} \quad R_n^0(u) = \sum_{j=2}^{\infty} \frac{1}{j!} \left(\widehat{\varphi}_n^0(u) - \varphi_0(m)\right)^j.$$

Also let

$$\mathbb{X}_n^{\varphi}(v) = (\mathbb{Y}_n^{\varphi})'(v) = \frac{\mathbb{X}_n^f(v)}{f_0(m)} - n^{3/5} \int_m^{t_{n,v}} R_n(u)du,$$

$$\mathbb{X}_{n,L}^{\varphi}(v) = -(\mathbb{Y}_{n,L}^{\varphi})'(v) = \frac{\mathbb{X}_{n,L}^f(v)}{f_0(m)} - n^{3/5} \int_{t_{n,v}}^{s_{n,L}} R_n^0(u)du,$$

$$\mathbb{X}_{n,R}^{\varphi}(v) = (\mathbb{Y}_{n,R}^{\varphi})'(v) = \frac{\mathbb{X}_{n,R}^f(v)}{f_0(m)} - n^{3/5} \int_{s_{n,R}}^{t_{n,v}} R_n^0(u)du.$$

The above definitions are motivated by the following identities.

Lemma 7.23 (f to φ identities)**.** *We have*

$$f_0(m)^{-1} \left(\widehat{f}_n(u) - f_0(m)\right) = \widehat{\varphi}_n(u) - \varphi_0(m) + R_n(u) \tag{7.121}$$

$$f_0(m)^{-1} \left(\widehat{f}_n^0(u) - f_0(m)\right) = \widehat{\varphi}_n^0(u) - \varphi_0(m) + R_n^0(u). \tag{7.122}$$

The φ-processes thus satisfy

$$\widehat{H}_n^{\varphi}(b) = n^{4/5} \int_m^{t_{n,b}} \int_m^v \left(\widehat{\varphi}_n(u) - \varphi_0(m)\right) dudv + \frac{A_n b + B_n}{f_0(m)} \tag{7.123}$$

$$\widehat{H}_{n,L}^{\varphi}(b) = n^{4/5} \int_{t_{n,b}}^{s_{n,L}} \int_v^{s_{n,L}} \left(\widehat{\varphi}_n^0(u) - \varphi_0(m)\right) dudv + \frac{A_{n,L} n^{1/5} (s_{n,L} - t_{n,b})}{f_0(m)} \tag{7.124}$$

$$\widehat{H}_{n,R}^{\varphi}(b) = n^{4/5} \int_{s_{n,R}}^{t_{n,b}} \int_{s_{n,R}}^v \left(\widehat{\varphi}_n^0(u) - \varphi_0(m)\right) dudv + \frac{A_{n,R} n^{1/5} (t_{n,b} - s_{n,R})}{f_0(m)} \tag{7.125}$$

Proof. The identities (7.121) and (7.122) are just the exponential series expansion about the density at m,

$$\hat{g}(u) - f_0(m) = f_0(m)(\exp\{\hat{\varphi}(u) - \varphi_0(m)\} - 1) = f_0(m) \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{j!} (\hat{\varphi}(u) - \varphi_0(m))^j, \tag{7.126}$$

where $\hat{g}$ is either $\widehat{f}_n$ or $\widehat{f}_n^0$, and $\hat{\varphi}$ is either $\widehat{\varphi}_n$ or $\widehat{\varphi}_n^0$, respectively. Now (7.123), (7.124), and (7.125) follow directly from either (7.121) or (7.122) and the definitions of the processes. □

Lemma 7.24. *Taking $b \in [m - cn^{-1/5}, m + cn^{-1/5}]$ for any $c > 0$, we have*

$$R_n(b) = o_p(n^{-2/5}) \quad \text{and} \quad R_n^0(b) = o_p(n^{-2/5}), \tag{7.127}$$

uniformly for $b \in [m - cn^{-1/5}, m + cn^{-1/5}]$.

Proof. Note $(\hat{\varphi}(u)-\varphi_0(m))^j = O_p(n^{-2j/5})$, for $j \geq 2$, from by (5.8) for $\hat{\varphi} = \widehat{\varphi}_n^0$, and the analogous (4.17) on page 1319 of Balabdaoui, Rufibach and Wellner [2009] for $\hat{\varphi} = \widehat{\varphi}_n$, since $\varphi_0'(m) = 0$. Thus, we have shown (7.127). □

Lemma 7.25. *We have*

$$\mathbb{Y}_{n,L}^{\varphi}(b) - \widehat{H}_{n,L}^{\varphi}(b) \geq 0, \qquad \text{for } b \leq 0, \tag{7.128}$$

$$\mathbb{Y}_{n,R}^{\varphi}(b) - \widehat{H}_{n,R}^{\varphi}(b) \geq 0, \qquad \text{for } b \geq 0, \tag{7.129}$$

and

$$\int_{\infty}^{\tau_{n,-}^0} \left(\mathbb{Y}_{n,L}^{\varphi}(b) - \widehat{H}_{n,L}^{\varphi}(b)\right) d(\widehat{H}_{n,L}^{\varphi})^{(3)}(b) = 0, \tag{7.130}$$

$$\int_{\tau_{n,+}^0}^{\infty} \left(\mathbb{Y}_{n,R}^{\varphi}(b) - \widehat{H}_{n,R}^{\varphi}(b)\right) d(\widehat{H}_{n,R}^{\varphi})^{(3)}(b) = 0 \tag{7.131}$$

where $\tau_{n,-}^0$ is the largest left-knot of $\widehat{\varphi}_n^0$ (no larger than m) and $\tau_{n,+}^0$ is the smallest right-knot of $\widehat{\varphi}_n^0$ (no smaller than m).

Proof. By the process definitions,

$$\mathbb{Y}_{n,R}^{\varphi}(b) - \widehat{H}_{n,R}^{\varphi}(b) = \frac{1}{f_0(m)}\left(\mathbb{Y}_{n,R}^{f}(b) - \widehat{H}_{n,R}^{f}(b)\right),$$

so by Lemma 7.22 we can conclude for $b \geq 0$ that

$$\mathbb{Y}_{n,R}^{\varphi}(b) - \widehat{H}_{n,R}^{\varphi}(b) \geq 0,$$

with equality if $t_{n,b}$ is a right-knot, as desired. We have thus shown (7.129) and (7.131), and (7.128) and (7.130) are similar. □

Lemma 7.26. *The vector of processes $(\underline{\mathbb{X}}_n^{\varphi}, \underline{\mathbb{Y}}_n^{\varphi}) \equiv \left(\mathbb{X}_n^{\varphi}, \mathbb{X}_{n,L}^{\varphi}, \mathbb{X}_{n,R}^{\varphi}, \mathbb{Y}_n^{\varphi}, \mathbb{Y}_{n,L}^{\varphi}, \mathbb{Y}_{n,R}^{\varphi}\right)$ can be defined on a common probability space with a sequence of Brownian motion processes $W \equiv W_n$ such that for $0 < c < \infty$*

$$\sup_{b\in[-c,c]} \left| (\underline{\mathbb{X}}_n^{\varphi}(b), \underline{\mathbb{Y}}_n^{\varphi}(b)) - \frac{1}{\sqrt{f_0(m)}} \underline{G}_n(b) - \varphi_0''(m)\underline{P}_n(b) \right| \to_p 0 \qquad \text{as } n \to \infty, \tag{7.132}$$

where $\underline{G}_n$ and $\underline{P}_n$ are as in Lemma 7.20 and Lemma 7.21.

Proof. By (7.127), since $\varphi_0''(m) = f_0''(m)/f_0(m)$, we can conclude that (7.132) holds. □

We have established the appropriate characterizing properties of the φ-processes, and the limit distribution of the $\mathbb{Y}^{\varphi}$ processes. It remains to prove tightness of

the H^{φ}-processes. To begin, we discuss the topological spaces in which our convergences will occur. For $0 < c \leq \infty$, define

$$\mathcal{F}_{c,M} = \{f \in \mathcal{D}_c | f \text{ is non-increasing and } \|f\| \leq M\},$$

where "cadlag" means right-continuous functions which have limits from the left. Our H, $H^{(1)}$, and $H^{(2)}$ functions (for the constrained and unconstrained estimators) are continuous and the uniform norm is appropriate for them. The $H^{(3)}$ type functions lie in $\mathcal{F}_{c,M}$, and the uniform norm is too strong. For the convergence of the $\mathbb{Y}$-processes we used the J_1 Skorokhod metric. Unfortunately this also is too strong as it does not allow multiple jumps to approximate a single jump in $\mathcal{F}_{c,M}$ (see Remark B.0.10 in Appendix B of Doss [2013b]). Thus, we will use the so-called M_1 Skorokhod metric on $\mathcal{F}_{c,M}$. This is defined in Section 12.3 of Whitt [2002], and discussed in the following sections. We give a brief introduction here. The M_1 metric is defined as follows. For a set $A \subseteq \mathbb{R}$, let $\|x - A\| := \inf_{y \in A} |x - y|$. (Note that we have also taken $\|f\|$ to be the supremum of a function f over its domain. It will be clear from context which usage is intended.) For a function x and $\delta > 0$, let $w_s(x, \delta) = \sup \|x(t_2) - [x(t_1), x(t_3)]\|$, where the sup is taken over t_1, t_2, and t_3 such that $-c \vee (t_2 - \delta) \leq t_1 < t_2 < t_3 \leq c \wedge (t_2 + \delta)$.[1] Note that since sequences that converge in the J_1 topology also converge in the M_1 topology (Whitt [2002]), the weak convergences proved for the empirical processes in Lemma 7.26 still hold when we use the M_1 topology. By Whitt [1980] (see Theorem B.0.2 of Doss [2013b]), $\mathcal{F}_{c,M}$ is a complete, separable metric space. And furthermore we have the following.

Proposition 7.27 (Lemma B.0.9 of Doss [2013b])**.** *$\mathcal{F}_{c,M}$ is precompact, meaning that every sequence in $\mathcal{F}_{c,M}$ has a convergent subsequence (not necessarily lying in $\mathcal{F}_{c,M}$).*

This is the fundamental property we need for tightness arguments, to which we now proceed.

Lemma 7.28. *The processes $(\widehat{H}^{\varphi}_{n,L})'''$, $(\widehat{H}^{\varphi}_{n,L})''$, $(\widehat{H}^{\varphi}_{n,L})'$ and $\widehat{H}^{\varphi}_{n,L}$ are tight in $\mathcal{D}_c \times \mathcal{C}_c^3$ when $0 < c < \infty$. The same tightness holds if we replace the L-processes by the $R-$processes.*

Proof. We will discuss the tightness for the left-side processes. The argument for the right-side processes is analogous. Corollary 5.4 shows that for any ε, we can take $M > 0$ large enough that $(\widehat{H}^{\varphi}_{n,L})'''$ lies in $\mathcal{F}_{c,M}$ with probability $1-\varepsilon$. Since $\mathcal{F}_{c,M}$ is precompact in $\mathcal{D}_c$ by Proposition 7.27, $(\widehat{H}^{\varphi}_{n,L})'''$ is tight. Then $(\widehat{H}^{\varphi}_{n,L})''$ is uniformly bounded by Corollary 5.4, and since its derivative is uniformly bounded, and since the set of functions with their values as well as the values of their derivatives uniformly bounded by M is compact in $\mathcal{C}_c$ (via the Arzela-Ascoli theorem, see e.g. Royden [1988]), we can conclude that $(\widehat{H}^{\varphi}_{n,L})''$ is tight in $\mathcal{F}_{c,M}$. Similarly, since integrals on bounded intervals of uniformly bounded functions are also uniformly bounded, and by Lemma 7.29 below, together with

[1] Note that w_s coincides with the definition of Δ_{M_1} in Skorokhod [1956].

the fact that $n^{1/5}(s_{n,L}-b)$ is $O_p(1)$ by assumption we see that $(\widehat{H}^{\varphi}_{n,L})'$ and $\widehat{H}^{\varphi}_{n,L}$ are uniformly bounded, and their respective derivatives are uniformly bounded, so we can again conclude that they are tight. An identical argument works for the right-side processes. □

We will want to consider our processes in $\mathcal{C}_\infty$ and in $\mathcal{D}_\infty$. For the continuous processes in $\mathcal{C}_\infty$, Corollary 5 of Whitt [1970] says that processes that are tight in $\mathcal{C}_c$ for all $0 < c < \infty$ are then tight in $\mathcal{C}_\infty$. By Theorem 12.9.3 of Whitt [2002] (with Prohorov's theorem, e.g. van der Vaart and Wellner [1996] page 21), processes that are tight in $\mathcal{D}_c$, $0 < c < \infty$, are tight in $\mathcal{D}_\infty$. For the next lemma, recall the definitions of $A_{n,L}, A_{n,R}$ in (7.112) and (7.113).

Lemma 7.29. *As $n \to \infty$,*

$$|A_{n,L}| \to 0 \ \text{ and } \ |A_{n,R}| \to 0, \ \text{ almost surely.} \tag{7.133}$$

Proof. Because $s_{n,L}$ is strictly less than m, we can apply Corollary 2.12, so that $|A_{n,L}| = n^{3/5}\left|\mathbb{F}_{n,L}(s_{n,L}) - \widehat{F}^0_{n,L}(s_{n,L})\right| \le n^{-2/5} \to 0$ almost surely. Similarly, since $\mathbb{F}_{n,L}(X_{(n)}) = 1 = \mathbb{F}_n(X_{(n)})$, by the same corollary, $|A_{n,R}| \to 0$ almost surely. □

With Lemmas 7.25, 7.26, and 7.28 in hand, we can now finish the proof of the theorem. Fix a subsequence n'. Let let

$$\begin{aligned} Z_{n,L} &= \left((\widehat{H}^{\varphi}_{n,L})^{(3)}, (\widehat{H}^{\varphi}_{n,L})^{(2)}, (\widehat{H}^{\varphi}_{n,L})^{(1)}, \widehat{H}^{\varphi}_{n,L}, \mathbb{X}^{\varphi}_{n,L}, \mathbb{Y}^{\varphi}_{n,L}\right), \\ Z_{n,R} &= \left((\widehat{H}^{\varphi}_{n,R})^{(3)}, (\widehat{H}^{\varphi}_{n,R})^{(2)}, (\widehat{H}^{\varphi}_{n,R})^{(1)}, \widehat{H}^{\varphi}_{n,R}, \mathbb{X}^{\varphi}_{n,R}, \mathbb{Y}^{\varphi}_{n,R}\right), \end{aligned}$$

By Lemmas 7.26 and 7.28, $Z_{n,R}$ and $Z_{n,L}$ are both tight in the space $E_c \equiv \mathcal{D}_c \times \mathcal{C}_c^3 \times \mathcal{D}_c \times \mathcal{C}_c$ with $0 < c < \infty$. This means they are also tight in E_∞, by the discussion after Lemma 7.28. Thus there exists a subsubsequence n'' such that $Z_{n'',R}$ and $Z_{n'',L}$ converge weakly. By the Skorokhod construction (see e.g., Chapter 14 of Shorack [2000]), we may assume that the convergence is almost sure (a.s.). Let $(Z_{0,L}, Z_{0,R})$ be the limit and let $Z_{0,L} = (H_L^{(3)}, H_L^{(2)}, H_L^{(1)}, H_L, X_L, Y_L)$, and $Z_{0,R} = (H_R^{(3)}, H_R^{(2)}, H_R^{(1)}, H_R, X_R, Y_R)$. Note that $(\widehat{H}^{\varphi}_{n,R})^{(2)} = (\widehat{H}^{\varphi}_{n,L})^{(2)}$ and this function is of course concave with mode at 0, so $H_R^{(2)} = H_L^{(2)}$ must also be concave with mode at 0. Let

$$\tau_L = \sup\left(\widehat{S}^0(H_R^{(2)}) \cap (-\infty, 0)\right) \ \text{ and } \ \tau_R = \inf\left(\widehat{S}^0(H_R^{(2)}) \cap (0, \infty)\right) \tag{7.134}$$

with $\widehat{S}^0(H_R^{(2)})$ defined as in (5.10). There must be a sequence of knots $\tau_{n'',R} \in (S_n(\widehat{\varphi}_n^0) \cap (m, \infty))$ such that $n^{1/5}(\tau_{n'',R} - m) \to \tau_R$ a.s. To see that we can take $\tau_{n'',R}$ strictly greater than m, by (7.134) we see the only way $\tau_R = 0$ is if there exists a sequence of points of $\widehat{S}^0(H_R^{(2)})$ strictly greater than 0 and converging to 0. Similarly there is a sequence $\tau_{n'',L} \in (S_n(\widehat{\varphi}_n^0) \cap (-\infty, m))$ such that $n^{1/5}(\tau_{n'',L} \to \tau_L$ a.s. In our definitions of the (f- and φ-) processes, $s_{n,R}$

was any knot strictly greater than m satisfying $n^{1/5}(s_{n,R} - m) = O_p(1)$, and analogously for $s_{n,L}$. Take $s_{n'',R} = \tau_{n'',R}$ and $s_{n'',L} = \tau_{n'',L}$. Then let

$$s_{n''} = (n'')^{1/5}\left(\tau_{n'',L} - m, \tau_{n'',R} - m, \tau^0_{n'',-} - m, \tau^0_{n'',+} - m\right),$$

let $s_{n''} \to (\tau_L, \tau_R, \tau_-, \tau_+)$ and let $Z_0 = (Z_{0,L}, Z_{0,R}, \tau_L, \tau_R, \tau_-, \tau_+)$, where τ_- and τ_+ are the limits of the corresponding terms again by tightness from Proposition 5.1. By Lemma 7.26, if we let $Y \equiv Y_{a,\sigma}$ as defined in (7.101) with $a = |\varphi_0^{(2)}(m)|/4!$ and $\sigma = 1/\sqrt{f_0(m)}$, then

$$Y_R(b) = \int_{\tau_R}^{b}\int_{\tau_R}^{v} dY'(v)dv, \qquad X_R(b) = Y_R'(b) = \int_{\tau_R}^{b} dY',$$
$$Y_L(b) = \int_{b}^{\tau_L}\int_{v}^{\tau_L} dY'(v)dv, \qquad X_L(b) = -Y_L'(b) = \int_{b}^{\tau_L} dY'.$$

Let $\phi : E_c^2 \times \mathbb{R}^4 \to \mathbb{R}$ be defined by

$$\phi(z_1, \ldots, z_{16}) = \int_{z_{13}}^{z_{14}} z_8 d\lambda - dz_{11}$$

giving

$$\begin{aligned}\phi(Z_n) &= \int_{n^{1/5}(\tau_{n,L}-m)}^{n^{1/5}(\tau_{n,R}-m)} (\widehat{H}^{\varphi}_{n,R})^{(2)} d\lambda - d(\mathbb{Y}^{\varphi}_{n,R})^{(1)} \\ &= (\widehat{H}^{\varphi}_{n,R} - \mathbb{Y}^{\varphi}_{n,R})'(n^{1/5}(\tau_{n,R} - m)) - (\widehat{H}^{\varphi}_{n,R} - \mathbb{Y}^{\varphi}_{n,R})'(n^{1/5}(\tau_{n,L} - m)).\end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 7.30 below, $\phi(Z_{n''}) \to 0$ a.s., and $Z_{n''} \to Z_0$ a.s., and ϕ is continuous at z such that z_8 and z_{11} are continuous functions, so a.s. $\phi(Z_0) = 0$, i.e.

$$\int_{\tau_L}^{\tau_R} H_R^{(2)} d\lambda - d(Y_R^{(1)}) = 0 \quad \text{a.s.},$$

so condition (5.15) of Theorem 5.6 holds. Now, let $\phi_c : E_c^2 \times \mathbb{R}^4 \to \mathbb{R}$ be defined by $\phi_c(z) = \inf_{b\in[0,c]}(z_4(b) - z_6(b)) \wedge 0$ giving $\phi_c(Z_n) = \inf_{b\in[0,c]}(\widehat{H}^{\varphi}_{n,L}(b) - \mathbb{Y}^{\varphi}_{n,L}(b)) \wedge 0$. This ϕ_c is continuous since z_4 and z_6 are continuous, and $\phi_c(Z_n) = 0$ a.s. by Lemma 7.25, so $\phi_c(Z_0) = 0$ a.s., for all c. An analogous argument holds for the right-side processes. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}(H_L - Y_L)(b) &\le 0 \quad \text{for} \quad b \le 0, \\ (H_R - Y_R)(b) &\le 0 \quad \text{for} \quad b \ge 0,\end{aligned}$$

so (5.16) and (5.17) hold. Now, let $\phi_{R,c}(z) = \int \mathbb{1}_{[z_{16},c]}(z_{10} - z_{12})dz_7$ (where z_{16} corresponds to τ_+, z_{10} to H_R, z_{12} to Y_R, and z_7 to $H_R^{(3)}$). Let

$$\phi_R(z) = \int_{[\tau_+^0(z_2),\infty)} (z_{10} - z_{12})dz_7,$$

where $\tau_+^0(z_2)$ is defined as in (5.12) (and thus $\widehat{S}^0(z_2)$ is defined as in (5.10)). We want to show $\phi_R(Z_0) = 0$ a.s. Note that $\tau_+ \le \tau_+^0(Z_{0,2})$, although a priori we may not have equality. This is because a linear function may be well approximated by a nonlinear function, but the reverse is not true. Thus $\widehat{\varphi}_n^0$ could potentially have knots strictly between the limit knot $\tau_+^0(Z_{0,2})$ and m (on an $n^{-1/5}$ scale) so τ_+ could be smaller than $\tau_+^0(Z_{0,2})$, but $\widehat{\varphi}_n^0$ must have knots approaching $\tau_+^0(Z_{0,2})$ (on an $n^{-1/5}$ scale), so τ_+ cannot be larger than $\tau_+^0(Z_{0,2})$. By Lemma 7.25, $\phi_{R,c}(Z_n) = 0$ a.s., and by Lemma 7.31 below we can conclude $\phi_{R,c}(Z_0) = 0$ a.s. Now, let $c \to \infty$ to see

$$\int \mathbb{1}_{[Z_{0,16},\infty)}(Z_{0,10} - Z_{0,12})dZ_{0,7} = 0$$

and since the integrand is nonpositive and the integrating measure is nonpositive, this implies

$$\int \mathbb{1}_{[\tau_+^0(Z_{0,2}),\infty)}(Z_{0,10} - Z_{0,12})dZ_{0,7} = 0$$

as desired. An analogous argument holds for the functional

$$\phi_L(z) = \int_{(-\infty,\tau_-^0(z_2)]} (z_4 - z_6)dz_1$$

with $\tau_-^0(z_2)$ defined as in (5.11). Thus we can a.s. conclude $\phi_R(Z_0) = 0$ and $\phi_L(Z_0) = 0$, so we have shown condition (5.18) of Theorem 5.6 holds. We have shown that as $n'' \to \infty$, $Z_{n'',0}$ converge a.s., so weakly, to Z_0 which satisfies the uniqueness criteria of Theorem 5.6. Thus we conclude that the limit does not depend on the choice of subsequence, and so can conclude $Z_{n,L} \Rightarrow Z_{0,L}$ and $Z_{n,R} \Rightarrow Z_{0,R}$ both in E_∞, as desired. This ends the proof of Theorem 7.19. □

Here are the two remaining lemmas we used in the proof of Theorem 7.19.

Lemma 7.30. *Let $\nu_{n,R} = n^{1/5}(s_{n,R} - m)$ and $\nu_{n,L} = n^{1/5}(s_{n,L} - m)$. Then almost surely, recalling the notation $g(a,b] = g(b) - g(a)$, we have*

$$\left|\left(\widehat{H}_{n,R}^{\varphi} - \mathbb{Y}_{n,R}^{\varphi}\right)'(\nu_{n,L}, \nu_{n,R}]\right| \le \frac{4}{f_0(m)} n^{-2/5},$$

Proof. We have

$$(\widehat{H}_{n,R}^{f} - \mathbb{Y}_{n,R}^{f})'(b) = n^{3/5} \int_{s_{n,R}}^{t_{n,b}} (\widehat{f}_n^0(u)du - d\mathbb{F}_n(u)) + A_{n,R}$$

so that

$$\begin{aligned}(\widehat{H}_{n,R}^{f} - \mathbb{Y}_{n,R}^{f})'(\nu_{n,R}) - (\widehat{H}_{n,R}^{f} - \mathbb{Y}_{n,R}^{f})'(\nu_{n,L}) \\ = n^{3/5} \int_{s_{n,L}}^{s_{n,R}} (\widehat{f}_n^0(u)du - d\mathbb{F}_n(u)).\end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$\left(\widehat{H}^{\varphi}_{n,R} - \mathbb{Y}^{\varphi}_{n,R}\right)'(\nu_{n,L}, \nu_{n,R}] = \frac{n^{3/5}}{f_0(m)} \int_{s_{n,L}}^{s_{n,R}} (\widehat{f}^0_n(u)du - d\mathbb{F}_n(u))$$

which is bounded in absolute value by $2n^{-2/5}/f_0(m)$ almost surely, by applying Corollary 2.12 (recall, by definition, $s_{n,R}$ and $s_{n,L}$ are not equal to m). □

In the definition of $\phi_{R,c}$ in the lemma below, z_{16} corresponds to τ_+, z_{10} to H_R, z_{12} to Y_R, and z_7 to $H^{(3)}_R$. The variables defining $\phi_{L,c}$ are the analogous left-side terms.

Lemma 7.31. *For $n \geq 0$, assume $z_n \in E^2_c \times \mathbb{R}^4$ is such that z_n converges to z_0. Assume $z_{0,1}$ and $z_{0,7}$ are nonincreasing. Let $\phi_{R,c}(z) = \int \mathbb{1}_{[z_{16},c]}(z_{10} - z_{12})dz_7$ and $\phi_{L,c}(z) = \int \mathbb{1}_{[-c,z_{15}]}(z_4 - z_6)dz_1$. Assume further that $\phi_{R,c}(z_n) = 0$, $\phi_{L,c}(z_n) = 0$, $z_{n,10} - z_{n,12} \leq 0$ and $z_{n,4} - z_{n,6} \leq 0$. Then for $c > 0$, $\phi_{R,c}(z_0) = 0$ if c is not a discontinuity point of $z_{0,7}$ and $\phi_{L,c}(z_0) = 0$ if $-c$ is not a discontinuity point of $z_{0,1}$.*

Proof. We consider $\phi_{R,c}$, the proof for $\phi_{L,c}$ is analogous. For convenience, let $h_c(z) = \mathbb{1}_{[z_{16},c]}(z_{10} - z_{12})$, and then $\int h_c(z_n)dz_{n,7} - \int h_c(z_0)dz_{0,7}$ equals

$$\int (h_c(z_n) - h_c(z_0))\, dz_{n,7} - \int h_c(z_0)d(z_{0,7} - z_{n,7}). \tag{7.135}$$

The integrand of the first term in (7.135) is uniformly converging to 0. If we let x_1 and x_2 be any fixed continuity points of z_0 satisfying $x_1 \leq z_{0,22} \leq c \leq x_2$ then, for large enough n the measure $z_{n,7}$ has total mass bounded by $z_{0,7}(x_1) - z_{0,7}(x_2) + 2 < \infty$. Thus the first term in (7.135) converges to 0 as $n \to \infty$ since $dz_{n,7}$ is a nonpositive measure (Royden [1988], Chapter 11.5). Now since $z_{n,5}$ converges to $z_{0,5}$ in the M_1 topology, $z_{n,5}$ converges weakly to z_5, in the sense that for all $t \in (-c, c)$ that are continuity points of $z_{0,5}$, $z_{n,5}(t) \to z_{0,5}(t)$ as $n \to \infty$ (Lemma 12.5.1, Whitt [2002]). The integrand of the second term in (7.135) is uniformly bounded and has discontinuity points at $z_{0,22}$ and c, so $\int \mathbb{1}_{(z_{0,16},c)}h_c(z_0)d(z_{0,7} - z_{n,7})$ converges to 0. By assumption c is not a discontinuity point of $z_{0,7}$ so $\int \mathbb{1}_{\{c\}}h_c(z_0)d(z_{0,7} - z_{n,7})$ goes to 0 as $n \to \infty$. If $z_{0,16}$ is not a discontinuity point of $z_{0,7}$ then similarly $\int \mathbb{1}_{\{z_{0,16}\}}h_c(z_0)d(z_{0,7} - z_{n,7})$ goes to 0. Thus, assume $z_{0,16}$ is a discontinuity point of $z_{0,7}$. Then by the M_1 convergence of $z_{n,7}$ to $z_{0,7}$, there exists a sequence x_n of discontinuity points of $z_{n,7}$ such that $x_n \to z_{0,16}$. By the assumption that $\phi_{R,c}(z_n) = 0$, we know $(z_{n,10} - z_{n,12}(x_n) = 0$ (since $z_{n,10} - z_{n,12} \leq 0)$, and by uniform convergence, we see that $(z_{0,10} - z_{0,12})(z_{0,16}) = 0$. Thus $\int \mathbb{1}_{\{z_{0,16}\}}h_c(z_0)d(z_{0,7} - z_{n,7})$ converges to 0, and so (7.135) converges to 0 as $n \to \infty$, so we are done. □

8. Appendix: Supplemental material

Here is a statement of the general integration by parts formulas for functions of bounded variation, used in our proof of Proposition 7.12. See, e.g., page 102 of Folland [1999] for the definition of bounded variation.

Lemma 8.1 (Folland [1999]). *Assume that F and G are of bounded variation on a set $[a,b]$ where $-\infty < a < b < \infty$*

(A) If at least one of F and G is continuous, then

$$\int_{(a,b]} F dG + \int_{(a,b]} G dF = F(b)G(b) - F(a)G(a).$$

(B) If there are no points in $[a,b]$ where F and G are both discontinuous, then

$$\int_{[a,b]} F dG + \int_{[a,b]} G dF = F(b)G(b) - F(a-)G(a-).$$

The next lemma lets us control the difference of two concave functions. It is proved in Doss [2013b], page 143, for convex rather than concave functions.

Lemma 8.2 (Doss [2013b]). *Let g_1 and g_0 be concave functions on $[a,b]$, and let $t \in [a,b]$. Then*

$$\begin{aligned} g_0(t) - g_1(t) \le \frac{b-t}{b-a}(g_0(a) - g_1(a)) + \frac{t-a}{b-a}(g_0(b) - g_1(b)) \\ + \frac{(b-t)(t-a)}{b-a}(g_0'(a+) - g_0'(b-)). \end{aligned} \tag{8.1}$$

Proof. Let $\lambda = (b-t)/(b-a)$ so $\lambda a + (1-\lambda)b = t$, and thus by concavity

$$g_0(t) - g_1(t) \le \lambda g_0(t) + (1-\lambda)g_0(t) - (\lambda g_1(a) + (1-\lambda)g_1(b)),$$

and also by concavity

$$g_0(t) \le g_0(a) + (t-a)g_0'(a+) \quad \text{and} \quad g_0(t) \le g_0(b) - (b-t)g_0'(b-).$$

Thus $g_0(t) - g_1(t)$ is bounded above by

$$\lambda(g_0(a) + (t-a)g_0'(a+)) + (1-\lambda)(g_0(b) - (b-t)g_0'(b-)) - \lambda g_1(a) - (1-\lambda)g_1(b)$$

which equals

$$\lambda(g_0(a) - g_1(a)) + (1-\lambda)(g_0(b) - g_1(b)) + \lambda(t-a)g_0'(a+) - (1-\lambda)(b-t)g_0'(b-)$$

and so we have shown (8.1). □

Acknowledgements

Both authors owe thanks to Tilmann Gneiting for support during visits to the Applied Mathematics Institute at the University of Heidelberg in 2011-2012. We also owe thanks to Lutz Dümbgen for several helpful conversations.

References

Balabdaoui, F. and Doss, C. R. (2014). Inference for a mixture of symmetric distributions under log-concavity. *Bernoulli (to appear). arXiv:1411.4708.*

Balabdaoui, F., Rufibach, K. and Wellner, J. A. (2009). Limit distribution theory for maximum likelihood estimation of a log-concave density. *Ann. Statist.* **37** 1299–1331. MR2509075 (2010h:62290)

Balabdaoui, F. and Wellner, J. A. (2007). Estimation of a k-monotone density: limit distribution theory and the spline connection. *Ann. Statist.* **35** 2536–2564. MR2382657 (2009b:62077)

Billingsley, P. (1999). *Convergence of Probability Measures*, second ed. *Wiley Series in Probability and Statistics: Probability and Statistics*. John Wiley & Sons Inc., New York. A Wiley-Interscience Publication. . MR1700749 (2000e:60008)

Birgé, L. (1997). Estimation of unimodal densities without smoothness assumptions. *Ann. Statist.* **25** 970–981. MR1447736 (98g:62056)

Chacón, J. E. (2016). Mixture model modal clustering.

Chen, Y.-C., Genovese, C. R., Tibshirani, R. J. and Wasserman, L. (2016). Nonparametric modal regression. *Ann. Statist.* **44** 489–514. . MR3476607

Cule, M. and Samworth, R. (2010a). Theoretical properties of the log-concave maximum likelihood estimator of a multidimensional density. *Electron. J. Stat.* **4** 254–270. MR2645484 (2012f:62071)

Cule, M. and Samworth, R. (2010b). Theoretical properties of the log-concave maximum likelihood estimator of a multidimensional density. *Electronic Journal of Statistics* **4** 254–270.

Cule, M., Samworth, R. and Stewart, M. (2010a). Maximum likelihood estimation of a multi-dimensional log-concave density. *J. R. Stat. Soc. Ser. B Stat. Methodol.* **72** 545–607. MR2758237

Cule, M., Samworth, R. and Stewart, M. (2010b). Maximum likelihood estimation of a multi-dimensional log-concave density. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B* **72** 545–607.

Dieudonné, J. (1969). *Foundations of Modern Analysis*. Academic Press, New York-London. MR0349288

Doss, C. R. (2013a). logcondens.mode: Compute MLE of Log-Concave Density on R with Fixed Mode, and Perform Inference for the Mode. R package version 1.0.1. Available from http://CRAN.R-project.org/package=logcondens.mode.

Doss, C. R. (2013b). Shape-constrained inference for concave-transformed densities and their modes PhD thesis, University of Washington.

Doss, C. R. and Wellner, J. A. (2016a). Global rates of convergence of the MLEs of log-concave and s-concave densities. *Ann. Statist.* **44** 954–981. With supplementary material available online.

Doss, C. R. and Wellner, J. A. (2016b). Inference for the mode of a log-concave density Technical Report. arXiv:1611.10348.

Dümbgen, L. and Rufibach, K. (2009). Maximum likelihood estimation of a

log-concave density and its distribution function: basic properties and uniform consistency. *Bernoulli* **15** 40–68. MR2546798

Dümbgen, L. and Rufibach, K. (2011). logcondens: computations related to univariate log-concave density estimation. *Journal of Statistical Software* **39** 1–28.

Dümbgen, L., Samworth, R. and Schuhmacher, D. (2011). Approximation by log-concave distributions, with applications to regression. *Ann. Statist.* **39** 702–730. MR2816336 (2012e:62039)

Dümbgen, L., Samworth, R. and Schuhmacher, D. (2011). Approximation by log-concave distributions, with applications to regression. *The Annals of Statistics* **39** 702–730.

Folland, G. B. (1999). *Real Analysis*, second ed. *Pure and Applied Mathematics (New York)*. John Wiley & Sons Inc., New York. Modern techniques and their applications, A Wiley-Interscience Publication. MR1681462 (2000c:00001)

Groeneboom, P., Jongbloed, G. and Wellner, J. A. (2001a). A canonical process for estimation of convex functions: the "invelope" of integrated Brownian motion $+t^4$. *Ann. Statist.* **29** 1620–1652. MR1891741 (2003c:62075)

Groeneboom, P., Jongbloed, G. and Wellner, J. A. (2001b). Estimation of a convex function: characterizations and asymptotic theory. *Ann. Statist.* **29** 1653–1698. MR1891742 (2003a:62047)

Han, Q. and Wellner, J. A. (2016). Approximation and estimation of s-concave densities via Rényi divergences. *Ann. Statist.* **44** 1332–1359. . MR3485962

Hanson, D. and Pledger, G. (1976). Consistency in concave regression. *The Annals of Statistics* **4** 1038–1050.

Hildreth, C. (1954). Point estimates of ordinates of concave functions. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **49** 598–619.

Kim, A. K. H., Guntuboyina, A. and Samworth, R. J. (2016). Adaptation in log-concave density estimation. *arXiv:1609.00861v1*.

Kim, A. K. H. and Samworth, R. J. (2014). Global rates of convergence in log-concave density estimation. *Ann. Statist. (to appear). arXiv:14042298*.

Lachal, A. (1997). Local asymptotic classes for the successive primitives of Brownian motion. *Ann. Probab.* **25** 1712–1734.

Mammen, E. (1991). Nonparametric regression under qualitative smoothness assumptions. *The Annals of Statistics* **19** 741–759.

Mason, D. M. and van Zwet, W. R. (1987). A refinement of the KMT inequality for the uniform empirical process. *Ann. Probab.* **15** 871–884. MR893903

Pal, J. K., Woodroofe, M. and Meyer, M. (2007). Estimating a Polya frequency function$_2$. In *Complex datasets and inverse problems. IMS Lecture Notes Monogr. Ser.* **54** 239–249. Inst. Math. Statist., Beachwood, OH. MR2459192 (2010d:62087)

R Core Team, (2016). R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing. R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria.

Rockafellar, R. T. (1970). *Convex Analysis. Princeton Mathematical Series,*

No. 28. Princeton University Press, Princeton, N.J. MR0274683 (43 ##445)

ROYDEN, H. L. (1988). *Real Analysis*, Third ed. Macmillan Publishing Company, New York. MR1013117 (90g:00004)

RUFIBACH, K. (2006). Log-concave density estimation and bump hunting for IID observations. PhD thesis, Univ. Bern and Gottingen.

SEREGIN, A. and WELLNER, J. A. (2010). Nonparametric estimation of multivariate convex-transformed densities. *Ann. Statist.* **38** 3751–3781. With supplementary material available online. MR2766867 (2012b:62126)

SHORACK, G. R. (2000). *Probability for Statisticians. Springer Texts in Statistics*. Springer-Verlag, New York. MR1762415

SHORACK, G. R. and WELLNER, J. A. (2009). *Empirical Processes with Applications to Statistics. Classics in Applied Mathematics* **59**. Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics (SIAM), Philadelphia, PA. MR3396731

SILVERMAN, B. W. (1982). On the estimation of a probability density function by the maximum penalized likelihood method. *Ann. Statist.* **10** 795–810. MR663433

SINAI, Y. G. (1992). Statistics of shocks in solutions of inviscid Burgers equation. *Comm. Math. Phys.* **148** 601–621.

SKOROKHOD, A. V. (1956). Limit theorems for stochastic processes. *Theory Probab. Appl.* **1** 261.

VAN DER VAART, A. W. and WELLNER, J. A. (1996). *Weak Convergence and Empirical Processes. Springer Series in Statistics*. Springer-Verlag, New York. With applications to statistics. MR1385671 (97g:60035)

WALTHER, G. (2002). Detecting the presence of mixing with multiscale maximum likelihood. *J. Amer. Statist. Assoc.* **97** 508–513. MR1941467 (2003k:62152)

WATANABE, H. (1970). An asymptotic property of Gaussian processes. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **148** 233.

WHITT, W. (1970). Weak convergence of probability measures on the function space $C[0,\infty)$. *Ann. Math. Stat.* **41** 939–944.

WHITT, W. (1980). Some useful functions for functional limit theorems. *Math. Oper. Res.* **5** 67–85.

WHITT, W. (2002). *Stochastic-Process Limits. Springer Series in Operations Research*. Springer-Verlag, New York. MR1876437 (2003f:60005)